DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 225 935 SO 014 552

TITLE	The Youth Budget: Expenditures, Equity and Efficiency. Final Technical Report.
INSTITUTION	Columbia Univ., New York, N.Y. Conservation of Human Resources Project.
SPONS AGENCY	National Inst. of Education (ED), Washington, DC. Educational Policy and Organization Program.
PUB DATE	Oct 82
CONTRACT	400-78-0059
NOTE	310p.; For a related document, see SO 014 553. Some tables may not reproduce clearly due to small print type.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Research/Technical (143)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC13 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Access to Education; *Children; Day Care; Disadvantaged Youth; Employment; *Federal Government; *Financial Policy; Health; Housing; *Human Services; Income; Justice; Quality of Life; Recreation; Research Methodology; Social Science Research; Statistical Data; Tables (Data); Young Adults; *Youth
IDENTIFIERS	New York (New York); Texas (Houston)

ABSTRACT

The federal government's financial commitment to children and youth since the mid-1960's is examined, using data from the U.S. Bureau of the Census and from relevant government agencies. The report is divided into four chapters and appendices. Chapter one analyzes the portion of the federal budget devoted to youth from 1964 to 1980, types of services, and mechanisms through which federal assistance reaches youth. Chapter two examines all public expenditures for youth in New York City and Houston and discusses preparing "youth budgets" for large cities. Chapter three reports the distribution of federal funding for ESEA-Title I, medicaid, Aid to Families with Dependent Children, food stamps, Headstart, vocational education, school lunch, and social security programs. The final chapter explores reasons for the wide variation in spending on youth in Houston and New York City. Over 200 pages of appendices provide information on the Office of Management and Budget "Histfund" account expenditures, distribution of selected expenditures for youth aged 18-24, sources and methods for estimating public expenditures for services to children in New York City and Houston, and data sources and methodology for study of equity in the distribution of federal funds and measures of equity for eight government programs. (KC)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☒ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

- Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

ED225935

The Youth Budget: Expenditures, Equity and Efficiency

Final Technical Report

National Institute of Education
Youth Policy Studies - Youth Budget
Contract No. 400-78-0059

Submitted by

Conservation of Human Resources
Columbia University
October, 1982

SP 014 552

Acknowledgments

This report was prepared by the Conservation of Human Resources staff with the assistance of two sets of consultants. The project directors were Raymond D. Horton and Charles Brecher. Kurt Katzmar participated in the research during the project's first year; he was replaced by Toni Porter. Miriam Cukier served as a research assistant. Stanley Litow and his associates at Interface prepared an analysis of spending for youth services by the City of New York which is incorporated in the portion of the Appendix dealing with local expenditures in New York. Susan MacManus and Ronald Rae of the University of Houston prepared an analysis of local spending in Houston and Diann Cowling of the Department of Community Affairs prepared an analysis of state spending in Houston. These materials provided a basis for the appendix to this report dealing with public spending for youth in Houston.

Introduction

This report presents the findings of a study of four aspects of public policy towards youth in the United States. First, what has been the trend in the national commitment to youth as reflected in the federal budget for services to children and youth? Second, how does the total public sector (federal, state and local) commitment to services for children and youth vary among major urban centers? Third, how well does the distribution of federal spending among the states match the variations in apparent need for services among children and youth? Finally, to what extent are variations in total public expenditures for services to children and youth due to differences in unit costs of service rather than differences in the scope or quality of services. These four questions are addressed in the four chapters that follow.

Table of Contents

Introduction

Page

I. Trends in Federal Expenditures for Youth 1

- How Much for Youth? 1
- Expenditures for What? 2
- How Do Services Reach Youth? 9
- Extending Youth - Expenditures for Teenagers and Young Adults 12

II. Public Expenditures for Youth in Two Cities 17

- Two Cities: New York and Houston 18
- Methodological Findings 25
- Findings: Differences between New York and Houston 30

III. Equity in the Distribution of Federal Funds for Youth Services 39

- Demographics: A Basis for Defining Equity 44
- Overview of Findings 49

IV. Efficiency in the Delivery of Services to Youth 57

- Nutrition: The Case of School Lunches 58
- Income Maintenance 61

Appendices

Page

I. Allocation and Classification of Histfund Account Expenditures, 1964, 1970, 1976, 1980 69

II. Distribution of Selected Expenditures for Youth Aged 18-24 198

III. Sources and Methods for Estimating Public Expenditures for Services to Children and Youth in New York City 202

IV. Sources and Methods for Estimating Public Expenditures for Services to Children and Youth in Houston, Texas 235

V. Data Sources and Methodology for Study of Equity in the Distribution of Federal Funds 278

VI. Measures of Equity for Eight Programs by State 281

Chapter One

Trends in Federal Expenditures for Youth

How much does America care about its youth? The question can be answered in several ways, but a direct reply is provided by the federal budget. It reveals how much we as a nation spend on youth and the type of aid we make available to them. The purpose of this paper is to describe the scale and nature of the federal government's commitment to children and youth and the changes in this commitment since the mid-1960's.

Surprisingly, little systematic analysis has been done on this subject. Neither the federal budget itself nor the Special Analyses prepared by the OMB treat youth expenditures as a single category. While the Congressional Budget Office has examined budgetary options in selected program areas such as welfare reform and employment that affect youth, it has not developed a comprehensive format for monitoring youth expenditures. Similarly, the Brookings Institution annual budget review series Setting National Priorities has periodically examined selected programs affecting youth, but has not sought to review comprehensively expenditures in this area.

Because of the limited data upon which an analysis can be based, this effort to estimate a federal youth budget will address only three basic issues: (1) How much of the federal budget is devoted to youth and has this changed over the period 1964 to 1980? (2) What types of services are provided to youth with federal funds and how has this changed over the period 1964 to 1980? (3) Does federal assistance reach youth directly, through their families, or through some other mechanism, and has this aspect of youth policy changed over the period 1964 to 1980? Each of these questions is addressed in the sections which follow.

How Much for Youth?

Defining an expenditure for youth is a difficult and somewhat esoteric task. In fact an Appendix of approximately 100 pages has been prepared in conjunction with our estimates. But the results are simple and straightforward. (See Table 1). In fiscal 1980 the federal government will spend an estimated $45.3 billion to provide cash assistance and services to persons under 18. This sum represents 8.0% of all federal outlays and 10.7% of all domestic (total less defense and foreign aid) outlays in 1980. Similar estimates for 1964, 1970, and 1976 indicate that expenditures for youth have increased more rapidly than the budget as a whole; the youth share of the total budget rose from 3.5% in 1964 to 5.7% in 1970, and to 7.8% in 1976. The youth share of domestic outlays rose most rapidly (from 6.7% to 9.8%) between 1964 and 1970 and has grown at a less rapid pace since. Between 1970 and 1976 the youth share of domestic expenditures rose only from 9.8% to 10.5% and between 1976 and 1980 increased only modestly to 10.7%.

Changes in the share of the domestic budget devoted to youth cannot be related to changes in their share of the nation's population. (See Table 2). While expenditures for youth rose rapidly from 1964 to 1970, their share of the population fell slightly from 36.5% to 34.1%. And while the youth share of domestic outlays rose modestly during the 1970's, the share of the population under 18 fell sharply from 34.1 to just over 28.4% in 1979. Thus while federal spending for youth is proportionately less than their numbers might justify, it is also true that the share of federal spending devoted to youth has risen while their share of the population has fallen.

Expenditures for What?

The $45.3 billion spent for youth in 1980 was unevenly divided among ten types of services. (See Table 3). Income assistance represented over

TABLE 1

Expenditures for Children and Youth As A Share of Federal and Domestic Outlays

1964, 1970, 1976, and 1980

(Dollars in Thousands)

	1964	1970	1976	1980
Expenditures for children and youth	$ 4,174,792	$ 11,116,396	$ 28,621,823	$ 45,368,898
Total Federal outlays	118,583,768	196,587,786	366,439,402	568,933,423
Share for children and youth	3.5%	5.7%	7.8%	8.0%
Total domestic outlays	$ 62,139,553	$113,737,238	$271,457,385	$423,833,423
Share for children and youth	6.7%	9.8%	10.5%	10.7%

Source: Calculations based on Office of Management and Budget, "Historical Outlays by Function, 1948 to 1980."

See Appendix for details.

TABLE 2

Population of the United States by Age Group 1964, 1970, 1976, and 1980

	1964		1970		1976		1980	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Total Population	191,141,000	100.0	203,810,000	100.0	215,152,000	100.0	220,584,000	100.0
0-17 years	69,674,000	36.5	69,700,000	34.1	65,199,000	30.3	62,572,000	28.4
0-12 years	51,829,000	27.1	49,620,000	24.3	44,235,000	20.6	42,664,000	19.3
13-17 years	17,845,000	9.4	20,080,000	9.8	20,964,000	9.7	19,908,000	9.1
18-24 years	18,370,000	9.6	23,959,000	11.8	28,163,000	13.1	29,284,000	13.3
25 and over	103,097,000	53.9	110,151,000	54.1	121,790,000	56.6	128,728,000	58.3

Source: U. S. Department of Commerce, Social and Economic Statistics Administration, Bureau of the Census, Current Population Reports, "Population Estimates and Projections," Series P-25, no. 519, April, 1974, pp. 43, 49; Series P-25, no. 870, January, 1980, pp. 7, 17.

Table 3

Distribution of Expenditures for Children and Youth by Function
1964, 1970, 1976 and 1980
(Dollars in thousands)

	1964		1970		1976		1980	
Income	$2,877,780	68.9%	$4,866,101	43.8%	12,106,837	42.3%	16,105,565	35.5%
Education	593,133	14.2	2,783,608	25.1	4,575,866	16.0	7,489,144	16.5
Nutrition	294,233	7.0	694,985	6.2	4,964,680	17.3	8,793,032	19.4
Health	217,658	5.2	1,050,611	9.5	2,582,613	9.0	3,806,439	8.4
Housing	69,281	1.7	199,131	1.8	1,033,342	3.6	2,420,204	5.3%
Child Care	64,093	1.6	297,487	2.7	942,683	3.2	1,102,729	2.4
Employment	14,163	.3	512,462	4.6	1,198,786	4.2	2,919,774	6.4
Community Development	24,558	.6	661,904	5.9	951,227	4.2	2,354,715	5.2
Recreation	19,893	.5	37,836	.4	82,339	.3	121,001	.3
Justice	-	-	12,271	.1	184,050	.6	254,295	.6
	$4,174,792	100.0%	11,116,396	100.0%	$28,621,823	100.0%	$45,368,898	100.0%

Percentages may not total 100% due to rounding.

$16 billion or 35.5% of all funds devoted to youth. While 18 different federal programs provide income for youth, nearly three-quarters of the funds are spent for two programs--public assistance and social security. Social security, the largest single program aiding youth, provided an estimated $7.0 billion in cash assistance to the surviving children of deceased, disabled and retired workers. Public assistance provided over $4.9 billion to aid children in poor families.

Approximately one-third of all expenditures for youth is accounted for by education (16.5%) and nutrition (19.4%) services. The nearly $8.8 billion in nutrition consists of five programs with food stamps ($4.8 billion) and school lunches ($3.3 billion) accounting for most of the funds. The $7.5 billion in education spending involves 25 different programs, but activities under the ESEA account for $3.4 billion or over 45%. Four other education programs involve spending of at least one-half billion dollars - aid to federally affected areas, occupational and vocational education, educational activities under the Human Development Services (Head Start) program, and special education for the handicapped.

About $3.8 billion or 8.4% of all spending for youth is devoted to health services. Although eleven different programs provide health services to youth, medicaid accounts for an estimated $2.5 billion or 64% of the total. Among the remaining service areas, housing, employment and community development each account for between 5.2% and 6.4% of total youth spending. Child care accounts for approximately 2.4%, and recreation and criminal justice each account for less than 1% of the total spending for youth services.

While income assistance plays a dominant role in federal spending for youth, this is far less true in 1980 than in the mid-1960's. Between

1964 and 1970 the share of total spending for youth devoted to income assistance dropped from 69% to 44%, by 1976 it decreased further to 42% and by 1980 had fallen to only 36%. Between 1964 and 1970 the shift in federal spending was due to both relatively slow growth in spending for income assistance and especially rapid increases in spending for other services. Among the ten types of services to youth only income assistance grew less rapidly than all domestic outlays between 1964 and 1970. (See Table 4). All other services to youth grew more rapidly than total domestic outlays, reflecting the "Great Society" emphasis on a variety of social service programs. Included in this expansion of service spending was the ESEA which helped raise the educational share from 14% to 25%; the medicaid program which helped raise the health share from 5% to 10%; and the growth of youth employment programs which rose from less than 1% to nearly 5% of all youth spending.

Since 1970, the shifts in the nature of spending for youth have also been significant, if less dramatic. Education expenditures grew far less rapidly (169%) than either domestic expenditures (273%) or total youth expenditures (308%). Accordingly, the educational share of total spending for youth dropped from 25% to 17%. In contrast, nutrition programs, most notably food stamps, increased nearly twelvefold, and in 1980 accounted for a larger share (19%) of the youth budget than education. All of the other services received a relatively modest share of total youth expenditures. However, it is worth noting that the housing and employment shares of the youth budget increased while the health share has steadily fallen since 1970.

Table 4

Rate of Change in Expenditures for Children and Youth by Function 1964-70 and 1970-80

	1964-1970	1970-80
Income	69.1%	231.0
Education	369.3	169.0
Nutrition	136.2	1,165.2
Health	382.7	262.3
Housing	187.4	1,115.4
Child Care	364.2	270.7
Employment	3,518.3	469.8
Community Development	2,595.3	255.8
Recreation	90.2	219.8
Justice	-	1,972.3
Total Children and Youth	166.3	308.1
Domestic Outlays	83.0	272.6
Federal Outlays	65.8	189.4

How do Services Reach Youth?

Federal spending for youth needs to be considered not only in terms of amounts and functions, but also for the way in which government seeks to deliver assistance. Youths benefit from federal programs in any one of four ways. First, they may be the primary target population for services which they receive directly. School based educational services or a school lunch program are examples of direct services to youth. Second, the family may serve as the primary mechanism for delivering aid to their children. Cash assistance under the AFDC program and food stamp benefits to households with children are examples of services to youth as part of families. Third, services may be provided to a broad segment of the population with youth as one subgroup of the beneficiaries. Occupational training received by unemployed youths through programs for all unemployed persons or medical care provided by programs such as medicaid which benefit both poor children and adults are examples of services to youth as part of a larger population. Finally, a small number of programs benefitting youth do so in the form of public or quasipublic goods which simultaneously benefit both youth and the entire population. Examples of such services include research and demonstration projects in the fields of education or social services which both improve society's knowledge in these fields and provide some service to the participants.

When the youth budget is viewed in terms of the way in which services are provided, the importance of the family becomes clear. (See Table 5). In 1980 about 49% of all expenditures for youth serve their objective through the family. About one-quarter of the youth budget funds services that are provided directly to youth, while over one-fifth (21%) of the services reach youth as part of the larger population. Only about 4% of the youth budget takes the form of public goods.

While the role of the family remains significant, it has declined since the mid-1960's. From 1964 to 1970 the share of the youth budget relying on the family to deliver assistance fell from 68% to 47%. At the same time, the share of expenditures reaching youth through programs that serve a broader population rose from 6% to 21% and services provided directly to youth as a target population increased from 24% to 30%. The significant decline in the role of the family during the "Great Society" era was due to the limited growth of earlier programs such as AFDC operating largely through the family and the enactment and expansion of new programs aimed at poor people of all ages such as medicaid and community action.

Between 1970 and 1980 the pattern of delivery of youth services remained relatively stable. The share of assistance provided through families increased modestly from 47% to 53% from 1970 to 1976 but then fell again to 49% in 1980, still a sharp contrast to its more than two-thirds share in 1964. The share provided directly to youth has fallen from 30% to 26% since 1970 while the share provided to youth as part of a larger population fluctuated somewhat during the decade. The increase in assistance provided through families during the mid 1970's was due largely to the rapid increase in income maintenance and food stamp programs while the declines in other

Table 5

Distribution of Expenditures for Children and Youth by Service Delivery Type 1964, 1970, 1976 and 1980

(Dollars in Thousands)

	1964		1970		1976		1980	
Direct services to children and youth	$987,394	24%	$3,364,837	30%	$7,747,052	27%	$11,567,185	26%
Services to children and youth as part of families	2,854,483	68	5,234,759	47	15,126,926	53	22,307,253	49
Services to children and youth as part of larger populations	247,262	6	2,319,081	21	5,356,213	18	9,699,173	21
Public and quasi-public goods benefiting children and youth	85,653	2	197,719	2	591,632	2	1,795,287	4
Total	$4,174,792	100%	$11,116,396	100%	$28,621,823	100%	$45,368,898	100%

areas reflect slower growing outlays under education programs and the social welfare legislation first enacted during the Great Society period.

The rise and fall of different modes of delivering aid to youth is related to the changing functional distribution of the youth budget. Different functions rely primarily on different types of delivery structures. Cash is provided primarily to youth through their families, education is provided directly through schools, while medical care is provided primarily to youth in conjunction with efforts to reach broader segments of the population. (See Table 6). Thus, of the $16.1 billion in income assistance provided to youth in 1980 fully 92% was provided through families; of the $7.5 billion in educational services 96% was provided directly to youth; and of the $3.8 billion in medical care 83% was provided as part of a larger population. Of the major functions only nutrition has been split about evenly between families (food stamps largely) and direct services through school lunches and other programs. Consequently as greater emphasis was given to services over income,the role of the family declined. To the extent that educational services were increased, the direct delivery was favored; while emphasis on health, housing, employment and other social services meant that children were served as part of larger populations.

Extending Youth - Expenditures for Teenagers and Young Adults

Preparing estimates of a youth budget such as those described above necessarily implies that we know which individuals are youth and which are not. In fact, the above estimates are based on expenditures for all people under 18. But an additional aspect of the youth budget is worth exploring: What is the level of expenditures providing developmental services such as education and training for those between 18 and 24

Estimates of expenditures for those between 18 and 24 under federal programs in two major developmental areas - employment training and higher

TABLE 6

Distribution of Expenditures for Children and Youth by Service Delivery Type
(Dollars in Thousands)

	1964		1970		1976		1980	
	$	%	$	%	$	%	$	%
Direct Services to Children								
Income	24,839	2.5	43,452	1.3	160,270	2.1	173,053	1.5
Education	547,567	55.5	2,626,781	78.1	4,381,478	58.1	7,165,857	61.9
Nutrition	277,761	28.1	382,931	11.4	1,890,276	25.1	3,439,724	29.7
Health	103,974	10.5	267,187	7.9	501,309	6.6	475,421	4.1
Housing	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Social Services and Child Care	33,253	3.4	15,425	.5	59,551	.8	70,857	.6
Employment	-	-	29,061	.8	554,168	7.3	41,524	.4
Community Development	-	-	-	-	-	-	89,184	.8
Recreation	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Justice	-	-	-	-	-	-	111,565	1.0
TOTAL	987,394	100.0	3,364,837	100.0	7,547,052	100.0	11,567,185	100.0
Services to Children as Part of Families								
Income	2,763,071	96.8	4,723,574	90.2	11,019,180	72.8	14,819,074	66.4
Education	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Nutrition	16,472	.6	312,054	6.0	3,074,404	20.3	5,067,975	22.7
Health	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Housing	69,281	2.4	199,131	3.8	1,033,342	6.9	2,420,204	10.9
Social Services and Child Care	5,659	.2	-	-	-	-	-	-
Employment	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Community Development	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Recreation	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Justice	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
TOTAL	2,854,483	100.0	5,234,759	100.0	15,126,926	100.0	22,307,253	100.0
Services to Children as Part of Larger Population								
Income	89,870	36.4	99,075	4.3	927,387	17.3	1,115,438	11.5
Education	43,909	17.8	133,216	5.7	167,720	3.1	235,868	2.4
Nutrition	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Health	63,873	25.8	696,036	30.0	1,957,515	36.6	3,172,731	32.7
Housing	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Social Services and Child Care	16,222	6.6	244,628	10.6	851,577	15.9	969,400	10.0
Employment	14,163	5.7	481,844	20.2	644,618	12.0	2,878,250	29.7
Community Development	-	-	622,531	26.8	541,759	10.1	1,064,087	11.0
Recreation	19,225	7.7	36,842	1.6	81,587	1.5	120,669	1.2
Justice	-	-	9,909	.2	184,050	3.4	142,730	1.5
TOTAL	247,262	100.0	2,319,081	100.0	5,356,213	100.0	9,699,173	100.0
Public and Quasi-public Good Benefiting Children and Youth								
Income	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Education	1,657	1.9	23,611	11.9	26,668	4.5	87,419	4.9
Nutrition	-	-	-	-	-	-	285,333	15.9
Health	49,811	58.2	87,388	44.2	123,789	20.9	158,287	8.8
Housing	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Social Services and Child Care	8,959	10.5	37,439	18.9	30,955	5.2	62,472	3.5
Employment	-	-	1,557	.8	-	-	-	-
Community Development	24,558	28.7	39,373	19.9	409,468	69.2	1,201,444	66.9
Recreation	668	.7	994	.5	752	.2	332	.02
Justice	-	-	7,362	3.8	-	-	-	-
TOTAL	85,653	100.0	197,719	100.0	591,632	100.0	1,795,187	100.0

education - are presented in Table 7. Together, these funds have grown from 0.8% to 1.9% of domestic outlays between 1964 and 1980. During the first part of the 1970's the rate of growth for employment services for these older youths was far more rapid than for domestic outlays or for all expenditures for children and youth under 18, but this rate of increase has slowed in the later part of the decade. Higher education outlays grew rapidly from a relatively small base between 1964 and 1970, but in the 1970-1976 period the rate of growth was slower than for all domestic outlays and for total expenditures for children of youth under 18. In the later part of the 1970's these expenditures have again grown rapidly. Thus in the 1970's, both areas were significant sources of increased expenditures for services to older youth, but the trends have varied during the decade.

TABLE 7

Expenditures for Selected Programs for Youth Aged 18-24
(Dollars in 000's)

	1964	1970	1976	1980
Employment Programs *				
Temporary Employment Assistance	-	-	438,462	532,884
Employment and Training	52,901	308,454	1,554,265	2,084,088
WIN	-	19,722	56,465	61,685
Unemployment Insurance (T&E)	71,860	148,017	149,794	226,677
Community Services Administration	-	41,842	262	-
Job Opportunities Program	-	-		4,210
Subtotal	$ 124,761	$ 518,035	$ 2,279,258	$ 2,909,544
Higher Education Programs **				
Higher and Continuing Education***	147,291	1,029,131	2,455,165	3,765,310
Student Loan Insurance Fund	-	2,323	133,508	1,353,738
Higher Ed. Facilities Loan & Ins. Fund	-	114,199	-	4,828
Gallaudet College	2,354	5,153	29,678	49,768
Howard University	12,088	32,725	84,817	125,460
National Technical Institute for the Deaf	-	2,976	11,846	20,305
College Housing Loans	219,334	195,976	-	8,405
Eisenhower College Grants	-	1,880	1,000	-
Harry S. Truman Memorial Scholarship	-	-	10,000	-
Subtotal	$ 381,067	$ 1,384,363	$ 2,726,014	$ 5,327,814
Total Expenditures: Selected Programs for 19-24 Year Olds	505,828	1,902,398	5,005,272	8,237,358
Total Federal Outlays	118,583,70	196,587,786	366,439,402	568,933,423
Share of Selected Programs	.4%	9.7%	1.4%	1.4%
Total Domestic Outlays	62,139,553	113,737,288	271,457,305	423,833,423
Share for Selected Programs	.8%	1.7%	1.8%	1.9%

Source: Executive Office of the President, Office of Management and Budget, "Historical Outlays by Function, 1948-1981."

* Includes expenditures related to services for these ages 18-24.

** Includes all expenditures under these Histfund accounts.

***Includes student financial aid in 1980.

Chapter Two

Public Expenditures for Youth in Two Cities

The previous chapter identified trends in the federal commitment to children and youth since the mid 1960s, including the amounts of federal funds devoted to youth, the type of services which federal money supported, and the primary mechanisms for delivering these services. This chapter addresses a different set of questions: How much is the total budget - including local, state, and federal funds - for youth services in an urban area? How does the mix of services for youth differ from one community to another? To answer these questions, all public expenditures for youth in two large cities - New York and Houston - are identified and analyzed.

The significance of the findings is twofold. First, they show that it is possible to identify public expenditures for youth in a complex intergovernmental delivery system such as characterizes large American cities. Equally immportant, the effort identifies the problems associated with preparing comprehensive "youth budgets" for large cities. Second, the findings indicate there is a wide disparity in the level of funding for youth services among American cities and identifies particular service areas where the disparities are most pronounced.

The two sets of findings - substantive and methodological - are described more fully below. But in order to make these findings most easily comprehensible, some background information is required on the two urban centers including their economic base, governmental structure and population.

Two Cities: New York & Houston

New York City and Houston may be viewed as opposite ends of a spectrum embracing American urban areas. New York is an older city with a declining population, shrinking tax base, and no room to expand geographically. It is known as a "liberal" city with an inclination to support generous welfare programs, and as a "public" city which depends heavily on government for mass transportation, social services, and land use regulation. Houston, in contrast, is seen as a "conservative" city and as a "private" city which depends on private transport and private choice to the point where there is no city zoning ordinance. Houston is also a relatively new city with an increasing population, a rapidly growing economy, and substantial unincorporated acreage on its borders which permits geographic expansion.

As Table 1 demonstrates, these differences are not simply a matter of popular images. During the 1970's, New York City suffered losses in population, earned income and property income, and employment. In contrast, Houston (or more precisely Harris County) has experienced significant growth in each of these categories during the decade. Because of these different economic and political environments, Houston and New York comprise an illuminating pair of cities for analysis.

To facilitate comparisons the areas are defined in this study as the central city of the Standard Metropolitan Statistical Area (SMSA) in which it lies. In the case of New York, this includes the five boroughs of the City of New York; in the case of Houston, the City of Houston is the principal governmental entity. The central cities were chosen to insure that the units being compared were urbanized; much of the Houston SMSA, which comprises six counties in Southeastern Texas, is undeveloped, low-density land.

Table 1

Selected Changes in New York City and Harris County, 1970-1976

	1970	1976	% Change
New York City			
Population[a]	7,850.3	7,149.3	-8.9
Labor and Proprietor's Income[b]	32,286.8	28,750.9	-10.9
Property Income[b]	6,115.7	5,815.2	-4.9
Employment	3,888,642.0	3,515,613.0	-9.6
Harris County			
Population[a]	1,661.9	2,194.0	32.0
Labor and Proprietor's Income[b]	5,566.5	8,383.3	50.6
Property Income[b]	947.0	1,203.6	27.1
Employment	767,470.0	1,100,977.0	43.5

---

[a] Figures in thousands. Figures for 1976 column are 1978 estimates from U.S. Bureau of Census, Current Population Reports series p. 25, No. 867 and series p. 26, No. 78-32.

[b] Figures in millions of constant (1967) dollars. Figures are from Bureau of Economic Analysis, U.S. Department of Commerce, Local Area Personal Income.

The five boroughs of New York City hold a similar relationship to the New York SMSA as the City of Houston holds to the Houston SMSA, but there are significant differences. (See Table 2.) New York City is home to about 78 percent of the metropolitan area's population, while Houston houses 58 percent of its metropolitan area population. These population differences are related to the fact that New York City comprises 22 percent of the area's total land area while Houston comprises only 7 percent of its SMSA's land. However, each city houses about 90 percent of the area's welfare population. Both New York City and Houston are the center of the metropolitan area's economic activity with between 61 percent and 79 percent of the retail businesses, and between 74 percent and 86 percent of the manufacturing plants.

Within the context of the above general socioeconomic setting is the nature of the population, and particularly the youth population which is most relevant to an analysis of public expenditures for youth services. (See Table 3.) Of New York City's total 1976 population of 7,213,021 an estimated 1,876,956 or 26% are youth under age 18; of Houston's 1976 population of 1,323,580 an estimated 367,840 or 29% are under 18. Based on 1970 Census figures 21% of those under 18 in New York City lived in families which were below the poverty level while in Houston the figure was 17%. Estimates for 1976 indicate that by that year New York's population of children living in poor families had risen to 24% while Houston's had risen to 21%. Thus, by the middle of the 1970's a slightly greater proportion of children in New York City were likely to be in families suffering economic hardship than is the case in Houston.

The structure of government through which these children receive public services varies significantly between the two areas (see Table 4).

TABLE 2

New York City and Houston as Parts of Their Standard Metropolitan Statistical Areas

	New York City	New York SMSA	City as a % of SMSA	City of Houston	Houston SMSA	City as a % of SMSA
Population, 1975 (thousands)	7,481.4	9,561.1	78.2	1,326.8	2,286.2	58.0
Land Area, 1975 (square miles)	300	1,384	21.8	484	6,794	7.1
Personal Income, 1975 (millions of $)	46,345.0	56,199.6	82.5	12,226.4*	13,282.2	92.0*
AFDC Recipients, February, 1976	832,397	887,732	93.7	56,467*	62,507	90.3*
Local Government Employment, 1972	382,380	450,819	84.8	52,788*	62,032	85.1*
Retail Business Establishments, 1972	65,570	83,228	78.8	12,188	19,838	61.4
Manufacturing Establishments, 1972	24,306	28,410	85.6	2,336	3,170	73.7

Source: U. S. Bureau of the Census, County and City Data Book, 1977.

*Figures for Harris County. Data for City of Houston unavailable or inappropriate.

TABLE 3

Total Population and Youth Population in New York City and Houston, 1970 and 1976

	Total Population	Population Under age 18	Low Income Population Under age 18	Youth Share of Total	Poor Share of Youth
NEW YORK					
1970	7,894,798	2,240,168	463,933	28.3%	20.7%
1976	7,211,820	1,876,840	456,453	26.0	24.3
HOUSTON					
1970	1,231,572	440,493	76,323	35.7	17.3
1976	1,323,580	367,840	77,325	27.8	21.0

Sources:

The 1970 figures for Houston are from U.S. Bureau of the Census, Census of Population: 1970, Detailed Characteristics, Final Report PC (1) - D45 Section 1, Table 138, p. 1268 and Section 2, Table 207, p. 2338. The 1970 figures for New York are from Ibid., PC (1) - D34, Table 138, p.706 and Table 207, p. 1393.

The 1976 figures are unpublished data from the 1976 Survey of Income and Education.

TABLE 4

Governmental Units by Type in
New York City and Houston

Type of Unit	In New York City	In Houston
National Government	U. S. Government U. S. Postal Service	U. S. Government U. S. Postal Service
State Government	State of New York	State of Texas
General Local Governments with Property taxing power	City of New York	County of Harris City of Houston
Single-purpose Governments		Houston Independent School District Spring Branch Independent School District 14 other independent school Districts (partial overlap) junior college districts Harris County Flood Control District Harris County Hospital District water and utility Districts

(Continued)

(TABLE 4, p. 2)

Type of Unit	In New York City	In Houston
Public Benefit Corporations (Regional or statewide, with operations in area)	Dormitory Authority of the State of New York Metropolitan Transportation Authority NYS Job Development Authority NYS Housing Finance Agency NYS Medical Care Facilities Finance Agency NYS Urban Development Corporation Port Authority of NY and NJ Power Authority of the State of NY	Houston-Galveston Area Council Gulf Coast Waste Disposal Authority
Public Benefit Corporations (Local, with operations exclusively in area)	Battery Park City Authority City University Construction Fund Manhattan and Bronx Surface Operating Authority Municipal Assistance Corporation NYC Health and Hospitals Corporation NYC Housing Authority NYC Off-Track Betting Corporation NYC Transit Authority Staten Island Rapid Transit Authority Triborough Bridge and Tunnel Authority	City of Houston Housing Authority Port of Houston Authority Mental Health and Mental Retardation Authority of Harris County

New Yorkers pay taxes to only three governmental units - the federal government, the state and the city. In addition there are numerous public benefit corporations which provide services with subsidies from one or more general governments.

In Houston there is a strong county government as well as a separate municipal corporation. Moreover, the city does not perform as many functions as the consolidated City of New York does, so there are numerous single-purpose local governments which assess a separate property tax. The main function of these governments is the provision of primary, secondary, and higher education. This is carried out through twenty independent school districts, some of which extend beyond the boundaries of Houston and three junior college districts. Other functions provided by special purpose governments in Houston are water supply, public works construction, flood control, and hospitals. In addition to the numerous special districts with taxing power, Houston also has organizations that are similar to a public benefit corporation in that they collect user charges and issue revenue bonds. However, they were created for different reasons than the public benefit corporations in New York. Because of the fragmented structure in Harris County, the need for a county- or region-wide unit to perform certain functions became evident, and such state-chartered corporations as the Port of Houston Authority and the Gulf Coast Waste Disposal Authority were created.

Methodological Findings

The complex network of governmental units in an urban area makes it difficult to identify and compare total public expenditures for youth among urban areas. A principal purpose of this study has been to develop a method for undertaking such comparative analyses. The general problems encountered and the techniques developed to deal with them can be described in terms of a three stage process:

I. Identifying Governmental Units Serving Youth

The first necessary step is to identify those units which provide services to youth. This, in turn, implies some accepted definition of the concept of "service". In our initial explorations we defined three classes of services which governments might provide to children and youth:

A. Direct Services - This refers to services received by an individual for which it is possible to identify a particular client and a particular time and place for this service transaction. Included are seven types of direct services: (1) educational preparation; (2) employment counseling and occupational training; (3) personal health and mental health services; (4) criminal justice administration; (5) nutritional assistance; (6) recreational activities; and (7) child care and child protective services.

B. Indirect Services - This refers to services not provided directly to the individual but which represent line agency functions of government. Included are such services as street cleaning, garbage collection and fire protection.

C. Overhead Services - This refers to the support services required to run public agencies such as those provided by Personnel Departments and Law Departments as well as the operations of elected bodies such as the City Council or State Legislature.

Initially a basis was sought to identify the share of each type of service delivered to or provided on behalf of youth. In fact few bases could be developed for allocating either indirect or overhead services to youth other than their representation in the general population. Since automatic calculations based exclusively on population shares seemed to add little to the understanding of the allocation of public resources to youth, we subsequently dropped estimates of expenditures for indirect and overhead services to youth from our analyses. All subsequent analyses deal only with direct service expenditures; however it can be reported that in Houston 29% of all local government expenditures were for indirect or overhead services and in New York City 12% of municipal expenditures fell in this category.

Once the analysis was restricted to direct services, the next problem was to identify those agencies engaged in the provision of direct services. This required a comprehensive review of the budgets of all units of government since direct services to youth are found among a wide range of administrative units. For example within the City of New York 28 separate agencies (including a Miscellaneous agency included for budgetary purposes) were found to provide direct services to youth; in Houston eight different municipal agencies, four different county agencies and 21 other independent governmental units were found to provide direct services to youth. At the state level 15 Texas state agencies and 12 New York agencies were found to provide direct services to youth. At the federal level our earlier analysis identified 78 programs (defined as Histfund accounts) that funded services for children, but the data source does not indicate the geographic distribution of funds. Consequently, the Community Services Administration's series on Geographic Distribution of Federal Funds was used to identify federal programs. This source yielded 65 different programs which represented direct provision of services to youth (as distinct from federal grants-in-aid to local and state governments

40

which in turn provided the services). Thus up to approximately 100 different public agencies or programs may be involved in the provision of direct services to youth in an urban area.

II. Estimating the Share of Agency Expenditures Devoted to Youth Services

Most of the agencies engaged in providing services to youth are not concerned exclusively with youth. Only in a few instances - child welfare units or day care services, for example - are all agency expenditures devoted to services to youth. Even Boards of Education provide adult education programs as well as serving children. Thus in most cases estimates must be made of the share of agency expenditures related to youth services. Developing a justifiable basis for making this allocation represents the major task involved in preparing youth budgets. Adequate data are often not readily available and suitable proxy measures must be sought. The precise techniques used are described more fully in the Appendices; the important general conclusion is that youth shares, and hence youth budgets, even for direct services, can be estimated only roughly given existing data collection procedures and all findings must be interpreted in this light.

A final complication supporting this general conclusion is the fact that some expenditure items cannot be related to any particular target population. Notably debt service is generally not allocable to particular programs or client populations and was excluded from both the Houston and New York City analyses. For some units of government pension and fringe benefit items could also not be related to particular programs and hence also had to be excluded. Since units of governments within and among urban areas vary in these practices comparative analysis is particularly difficult, although we have made a maximum effort to treat similar items in comparable ways throughout the analysis.

III. Estimating the Geographic Distribution of Direct Youth Service Expenditures

Preparing youth budgets is also complicated by the fact that many agencies serve populations in areas broader than the area chosen for analysis. The federal government has responded to this problem through the Community Services Administration series on Geographic Distribution of Federal Outlays. However in some cases outlays are not identified by city, only by county or state, and independent estimates must be made. Perhaps more importantly, the CSA relies on relatively crude methods for allocating expenditures and its data series has been subject to criticism. Nevertheless it is a useful basis for estimating federal direct expenditures in an urban area.

Unfortunately such geographic distributions are generally not prepared for state expenditures or for areas within the jurisdiction of countywide or regional local units of government, Hence independent estimates of the share of service recipients living within municipal boundaries in counties, for example the share of Harris County youth living within the City of Houston, must be relied upon to allocate expenditures for youth services made by county and regional governments. Additional problems arise in analyzing independent school district expenditures when these district boundaries correspond to neither county nor municipal boundaries.

The overall conclusion regarding preparation of total public sector youth budgets is that it is a complex task involving examination of numerous financial documentsaand estimates based on often inadequate data. The process is time consuming and provides results that must be interpreted cautiously. This suggests that large scale comparative analysis of public expenditures for youth would be an expensive task unless basic reforms in reporting procedures are initiated by a variety of governmental units. Moreover completing such analyses would require a close familiarity with the overall governmental structure of each metropolitan area.

Findings: Differences Between New York and Houston

Findings resulting from the application of the methodology described above can best be described in terms of two general conclusions.

I. The Role of Each Level of Government in Providing Youth Services Varies Between Cities.

Table 5 summarizes the estimates of the amounts spent in each area by each level of government in a direct provision of youth services. These sums differ from the total amounts spent by each level of government since intergovernmental transfers are counted as expenditures by the last unit receiving the funds not the unit initially raising the funds. Thus the estimates represent the role of each level of government in actually delivering services not their role as financers of services.

The greatest similarity between New York and Houston is in the federal government's role as a provider of services. Federal expenditures account for 10% of the total in New York and under 12% of the total in Houston. The specific number of federal programs operating in each area varied somewhat; 65 programs provided services to children in New York and only 41 in Houston. However in both places the same 12 major programs

TABLE 5

Expenditures for Direct Services to Youth by Level of Government, New York and Houston, FY 1978

	New York		Houston	
	Total Amount ($ in millions)	Percent Distribution	Total Amount ($ in millions)	Percent Distribution
Federal Agencies	$ 593.3	10.2	$ 60.1	11.6
State Agencies	71.3	1.2	35.8	6.9
Local Units - Subtotal	5,144.8	88.6	422.7	81.5
City and County Agencies	4,971.9	85.5	51.3	9.9
Independent School Districts	—	—	351.8	67.8
Authorities and Others	172.9	3.4	19.6	3.8
Grand Total	$5,809.4	100.0	$518.6	100.0

Source: See Appendix.

accounted for the bulk of all federal spending - 95 percent of the outlays in New York and 96 percent in Houston. These major programs are listed in Table 6. Most of the programs provide direct cash benefits including the various social security benefit programs, SSI, veterans death benefits, and railroad retirement benefits. Similar to cash assistance is the food stamp program. There are really no direct service operations since the remaining service oriented programs are operated largely through contracts with private nonprofit agencies. These include the child development and community action programs. Thus in both New York and Houston the role of the federal government in youth services is restricted to dispersement of cash assistance and food stamps and some contracting for social services.

The state governments role varies more widely between New York and Houston. The State of Texas accounts for nearly 7% of youth expenditures compared to a state share of only 1% in New York City. In both places the state provides youth detention facilities and mental health and mental retardation services. The principal difference is that the State of Texas, through its Department of Human Resources, assumes responsibility for public assistance, medicaid and other social welfare services, while in New York these functions are administered by municipal government. If spending by the Department of Human Resources were dropped from the Texas State total, the state government would represent only about 2% of total youth spending, a figure close to the New York State share.

In both places local governments account for the bulk of services delivered to youth, 89% in New York versus 82% in Houston. As noted above most of this difference reflects the administration of welfare programs by state government in Houston.

TABLE 6

Total and Per Child Outlays for Youth Under Major Federal Youth Programs, New York and Houston, 1978

	Amount ($ in thousands)	Amount Per Child	Percent Distribution	Amount ($ in thousands)	Amount Per Child	Percent Distribution
Social Security Retirement	$ 212,781	113	35.7	$ 18,138	49	30.2
Food Stamps Coupons	146,559	78	24.7	13,225	36	22.0
Social Security Survivors	61,377	33	10.3	9,190	25	15.3
Social Security Disability	37,728	20	6.4	3,971	11	6.6
Child Development and Headstart*	6,451	3	1.1	3,612	10	6.0
Community Action	13,641	7	2.3	3,224	9	5.4
Subsidized Housing	37,826	20	6.4	1,477	4	2.5
WIC	16,152	9	2.7	1,360	4	2.3
SSI	13,367	7	2.3	1,286	3	2.1
Railroad Retirement Fund	1,739	1	0.3	772	2	1.3
Veterans Death Benefits	3,055	2	0.5	648	2	1.1
Community Mental Health Centers	11,711	6	2.0	501	1	0.8
Subtotal - Major Programs	562,387	300	94.8	57,404	156	95.5
TOTAL - All Programs	$ 593,251	316	100.0	$ 60,084	163	100.0

*New York City figure excludes funds paid to local government for operation of programs.

Source: See Appendix.

While the overall role of local government is similar in both places, the divisions within the local sector are quite different. Virtually all local spending in New York is handled through the consolidated municipal government of the City of New York. Even spending by the Board of Education and the Health and Hospitals Corporation are represented in the municipal budget since these agencies depend heavily on local tax subsidies and have no independent taxing authority. The only agency with significant independent revenues providing services to youth is the New York City Housing Authority with a youth budget of $172.9 million or 3.1% of total youth spending. In contrast the City of Houston accounts for less than 8% of all youth expenditures and other independent local governments each play a significant role in youth service delivery. Independent school districts with seperate taxing authority account for the bulk of the spending - $351.6 million or 67.8% of the total. By comparison New York City's Board of Education, a division of city government, represents only 42% of total youth spending in New York, indicating a smaller role for the schools in youth service delivery in New York. Other important units in Houston are Harris County government (including the Child Welfare Unit) with 2% of the total youth budget, the independent Hospital District with 2%, and the City Housing Authority and the county Mental Health and Mental Retardation Authority, each with smaller shares of the total.

II. The Level of Expenditures for Youth Services Varies Dramatically Between Cities.

When spending by all levels of government is viewed in total there is a substantial difference in the level of expenditures between New York and Houston (See Table 7). Public spending for youth services per child

TABLE 7

Public Spending per Child for Youth Services in New York and Houston by Function, FY 1978

	New York	Houston	Ratio
Education	$ 1,343	$ 851	1.6
Employment & Training	47	14	3.4
Health and Mental Health	321	109	2.9
Income & Housing Assistance	817	151	5.4
Criminal Justice	88	48	1.8
Nutrition	163	130	1.3
Recreation	36	40	0.9
Child Care & Protection	280	66	4.2
TOTAL	$ 3,095	$ 1,410	2.2

is more than twice as high in New York as in Houston - $3,095 versus $1,410. The bulk of this difference is in state and local spending, $2,769 per child versus $1,246 per child. However it is interesting to note that even among direct federal programs, which are presumably operated uniformly around the nation, spending per child was still twice as high in New York as in Houston. (See Table 6)

The differences in spending are not uniform among the various types of youth services. In fact spending per child for recreation services is actually greater in Houston than in New York. For other categories of services the amount of spending per child in New York varies from 1.3 times greater in New York (nutrition) to 5.4 times greater (income and housing assistance).

Because some of the largest differences in spending per child are in services that are generally targeted to poor children, notably health, income assistance and child care services, it may be more appropriate to assess such spending in terms of amounts per child in poverty rather than in relation to the total population under 18. If, as Table 3 above indicated, a greater proportion of youth in New York City are living in families with poverty incomes, then this may help explain the greater rates of spending in New York City. Table 8 presents public expenditures by service type in terms of spending per poor child.

Spending per poor child is, overall, somewhat less than two times greater in New York than in Houston. But dramatic variations still remain in spending per child for the services aimed primarily at poor children - income and housing, child care and protection, employment and training, and health services.

TABLE 8

Total Public Spending Per Poor Child in New York and Houston by Function, FY 1978

	New York	Houston	Ratio
Education	$ 5,524	$ 4,048	1.4
Employment & Training	192	65	3.0
Health and Mental Health	1,322	521	2.5
Income & Housing Assistance	3,360	719	4.7
Criminal Justice	361	227	1.6
Nutrition	669	620	1.1
Recreation	149	191	0.8
Child Care & Protection	1,150	316	3.6
TOTAL	$12,727	$ 6,707	1.9

Chapter Three

Equity in the Distribution of Federal Funds for Youth Services

This chapter is concerned with the question of equity: Is federal funding for youth services distributed among states in proportion to the children who need services? To answer this question, the chapter examines the distribution of federal spending for eight selected programs funding youth services: ESEA - Title I, Medicaid, Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC), Food Stamps, Headstart, Vocational Education, School Lunch, and Social Security Survivors Benefits (OASDI). These eight programs are the largest among the 84 programs identified as funding youth services. In fiscal year 1980, each program represented at least $705 million in annual spending for youth and the combined expenditures for the eight programs accounted for almost 70 percent of the total federal children's budget (Table 1).

Moreover, these eight programs account for a significant share of federal spending in major functional areas. In 1980, funds for OASDI and AFDC represented almost 75 percent of all income maintenance expenditures for children; the School Lunch and Food Stamps programs accounted for more than 90 percent of expenditures for child nutrition; Medicaid funds for children represented nearly two-thirds of federal spending for child health services; Headstart accounted for almost 65 percent of all federal expenditures for child care and social services; and the two selected education programs represented more than one-half of federal expenditures for education services to youth.

Table 1

Role of Eight Major Programs in Federal Spending for Youth Services

Fiscal Year 1980

(dollars in thousands)

	Amount	Percent of Subtotal	Percent of Total
Income Assistance - Subtotal	16,105,565	100.0	39.7
Public Assistance - AFDC	4,933,519	30.6	12.2
Social Security Survivors Benefits - OASDI	6,968,284	43.3	17.2
Others	4,203,762	26.1	10.3
Nutrition - Subtotal	8,793,032	100.0	21.6
Food Stamps	4,755,544	54.1	11.7
School Lunch	3,290,134	37.4	8.1
Others	747,354	8.5	1.8
Education - Subtotal	7,489,144	100.0	18.4
ESEA - Title I	3,409,034	45.5	8.4
Vocational Education	754,620	10.1	1.8
Others	3,325,490	44.4	8.2
Health - Subtotal	3,806,439	100.0	9.4
Medicaid	2,471,173	64.9	6.1
Others	1,335,266	35.1	3.3
Employment	2,919,774	100.0	7.2
Children & Social Services - Subtotal	1,102,729	100.0	2.7
Headstart	705,044	63.9	1.7
Others	397,685	36.1	1.0
Judicial Services	254,295	100.0	0.6
Recreation	121,001	100.0	0.3
TOTAL	40,591,979	100.0	100.0
Eight Major Programs	27,287,352	67.2	67.2
Others	13,304,627	32.8	32.8

Source: Appendix I.

It is also important to note that the eight major programs represent significant portions of the dollars distributed through each major type of funding mechanism. Federal spending for youth services, like all federal spending, takes place through one of five different types of funding mechanisms:

(1) direct payment programs provide funds through federal operations;

(2) project grants award funds to project sponsors on the basis of specific project applications;

(3) fixed formula grants provide funds to eligible beneficiaries (usually states and localities) on the basis of predetermined formulas applied to fixed congressional appropriations;

(4) open-ended grants provide funds to eligible recipients on the basis of predetermined criteria but the amount received is based on the numbers eligible, not a fixed appropriation;

(5) all other forms of payment are classified as "others".

The largest share of the children's budget is distributed through direct payment programs (Table 2). This includes income support for children under insurance programs for the beneficiaries of retired, disabled or deceased workers, or other special categories of workers such as coal miners and railroad workers. Fully 42 percent of the children's budget in 1976 (the latest year for which complete data could be assembled for this paper) was distributed through such direct payment programs. The second largest share of the children's budget is distributed through open formula grants. This category includes so-called "categorical" programs such as AFDC and Medicaid designed to provide a specific population with particular assistance or services. Almost one-third of the children's budget was

Table 2

Eight Major Youth Programs and Funding Mechanisms in the Federal Youth Budget

Fiscal Year 1976

(dollars in thousands)

	Amount	Percent of Subtotal	Percent of Total
Direct Payment - Subtotal	11,354,474	100.0	41.8
Social Security Survivors Benefits-OASDI	6,230,158	54.9	23.0
Food Stamps	2,969,907	26.2	10.9
Others	2,154,409	18.9	7.9
Formula Distribution, Open-ended Funds	8,694,648	100.0	32.0
Public Assistance - AFDC	4,921,131	56.6	18.1
School Lunch	1,451,116	16.7	5.3
Medicaid	1,303,409	15.0	4.8
Others	1,018,992	11.7	3.8
Formula Distribution, Fixed Funds	3,389,231	100.0	12.5
ESEA - Title I	1,939,481	57.2	7.1
Vocational Education	422,629	12.5	1.6
Others	1,027,121	30.3	3.8
Project Funding	2,891,814	100.0	10.7
Headstart	415,055	14.4	1.5
Others	2,476,759	85.6	9.1
Others	796,820	100.0	2.8
TOTAL	27,126,987	100.0	100.0
Eight Major Programs	19,652,886	72.4	72.4
Others	7,474,101	27.6	27.6

Sources: Classification of programs based on information in _1978 Catalogue of Federal Domestic Assistance Programs_; total dollar amounts for programs are as reported in Community Services Administration, _1976 Federal Outlays in Summary_; youth shares of program expenditures are estimated as described in Appendix I.

distributed through this type of funding mechanism in 1976. Approximately 12 percent of the children's budget was distributed through fixed formula grant programs such as ESEA - Title I and Vocational Education in 1976. Project grants, generally used to support narrowly defined programs for a limited purpose or population group, accounted for 11 percent of the children's budget. A large number of education programs in the children's budget fall into this category, as do many child health programs. The "other" funding category represents only 3 percent of the youth budget and consists of funding which wholly supports federal agency activities such as those of the National Park Services and the Smithsonian Institution.

Among the eight major youth programs, two provide funds to children through direct payment mechanisms: OASDI and Food Stamps. The over $9.2 billion dollars distributed through these programs in 1976 accounted for approximately 81 percent of all direct payments in the youth budget. Payments to children as beneficiaries of Social Security represented nearly 55 percent of this amount, while the children's share of Food Stamps dollars accounted for another 26 percent. The three programs which provide support for children through open formula grants -- AFDC, Medicaid, and School Lunch -- represented almost 90 percent of all funds provided to children through this mechanism. Funds for the federal share of AFDC accounted for 57 percent of all open formula expenditures, while funds for Medicaid and School Lunch accounted for roughly equal shares of the remaining funds - 16.7 percent and 15.0 percent, respectively. Of the other programs, two -- Title I of ESEA and Vocational Education -- are distributed through fixed formula grant programs, while Headstart is funded through project grants. Funds for ESEA represented more than one-half -- 57 percent of federal dollars for children provided through fixed formula grant programs; the Headstart program accounts for about 14 percent of project grant funds for youth services.

In sum, the eight major programs selected for analysis in this paper comprise a useful basis for an inquiry into equity in the distribution of federal spending for youth. These eight programs represent over two-thirds of all federal spending for youth; they comprise major shares of funding in each of the principal functional areas for which the federal government supports youth services; and they are representative of the principal funding mechanisms through which the federal government distributes its domestic dollars.

Demographics: A Basis for Defining Equity

Pending release of the detailed reports from the 1980 census, the most comprehensive demographic data source is the 1976 Survey of Income and Education. In that year, the 64,619,000 persons under 18 represented slightly less than one-third (31.5 percent) of the United States' population (Table 3). Like the general population, children were not evenly divided among the fifty states. More than one-half of all children lived in ten states: California, New York, Texas, Pennsylvania, Ohio, Illinois, Michigan, Florida, New Jersey, and Massachusetts. The largest number of children, 6.2 million or almost 10 percent of the total, lived in California, followed by 5 million children in New York, and 3.9 million in Texas. In contrast, the three states with the smallest number of children were Vermont (147,000), Alaska (128,000), and Wyoming (120,000).

The distribution of children does not directly parallel the distribution of the adult population. That is, among the states the share of the population under 18 varies significantly around the national average. The state with the largest share of the population under 18 was Utah (37.6 percent) followed by Alaska (37.1 percent). The state with the smallest share of the population under 18 was Florida

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 3

Persons Under 18 by State

1976

(in thousands)

State	Total Population	Population Under 18	Percent of Population Under 18
Total	211,308	64,619	31.5
Alabama	3,585	1,135	31.7
Alaska	345	128	37.1
Arizona	2,274	743	32.7
Arkansas	2,126	649	30.5
California	20,981	6,200	29.6
Colorado	2,536	797	31.4
Connecticut	3,062	897	29.3
Delaware	575	181	31.5
District of Columbia	693	188	27.1
Florida	8,493	2,314	27.2
Georgia	4,908	1,582	32.2
Hawaii	842	275	32.7
Idaho	828	279	33.7
Illinois	10,983	3,401	30.9
Indiana	5,258	1,677	31.9
Iowa	2,836	899	31.3
Kansas	2,227	652	29.3
Kentucky	3,372	1,055	31.3
Louisiana	3,739	1,268	33.9
Maine	1,054	326	30.9
Maryland	4,055	1,275	31.4
Massachusetts	5,746	1,697	29.5
Michigan	9,063	2,890	31.9
Minnesota	3,888	1,245	32.0
Mississippi	2,325	793	34.1
Missouri	4,704	1,382	29.4
Montana	745	237	31.8
Nebraska	1,527	477	31.2
Nevada	601	189	31.4
New Hampshire	818	255	31.2
New Jersey	7,240	2,192	30.3
New Mexico	1,152	398	34.5
New York	17,815	5,089	28.6
North Carolina	5,369	1,609	29.9
North Dakota	621	203	32.7
Ohio	10,632	3,363	31.6
Oklahoma	2,680	796	29.7
Oregon	2,290	678	29.6
Pennsylvania	11,663	3,399	29.1
Rhode Island	912	266	29.2
South Carolina	2,781	906	32.6
South Dakota	672	214	31.8
Tennessee	4,178	1,251	29.9
Texas	12,287	3,953	31.2
Utah	1,221	459	37.6
Vermont	469	147	31.3
Virginia	4,907	1,467	29.9
Washington	3,496	1,072	30.7
West Virginia	1,792	516	28.8
Wisconsin	4,569	1,435	31.4
Wyoming	376	120	31.9

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, Current Population Reports, Series P-60, 110, 111, 112, 113, "Money Income and Poverty Status in 1975 of Families and Persons in the United States and the Northeast Region (No. 110); the North Central Region (No. 111); the South Region (No. 112); and the West Region (No. 113) [Spring 1976 Survey of Income and Education]," U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 1978.

(27.2 Percent) and the District of Columbia had an even lower share (27.1 percent).

From the perspective of federal programs, poor children are often of special interest. Nationally, in 1976 approximately 14.8 percent of all children lived in families whose incomes were below the poverty threshhold (Table 4). But this figure varies widely among the states from under 8 percent in Alaska to almost 33 percent in Mississippi. In New York and California, the two states with the largest number of children, the share of children living in poverty is just below the national average -- 13.8 percent and 14.6 percent, respectively. In 11 states -- Mississippi, New Mexico, South Carolina, Louisiana, Georgia, Arkansas, Kentucky, Florida, Texas, Tennessee, and West Virginia -- more than 20 percent of all children live in poverty. Six of those states are located in the South.

The uneven distribution of both all children and poor children among the states provides the bases for establishing standards of equity for the distribution of federal expenditures for youth. Several criteria for assessing equity can be identified. The first two measures deal with the level of federal spending among the states:

(1) Expenditures per child indicates the extent to which program spending is distributed among the states in proportion to the youth population;

(2) Expenditures per poor child indicates the extent to which program spending is distributed among the states in proportion to the population of poor children.

A second set of criteria deals not with spending, but with the reach of federal programs in terms of the numbers of persons served:

(3) Ratio of youth beneficiaries to residents under 18 indicates the extent to which a federal program is reaching the youth population;

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 4

Persons Under 18 in Low-Income Families by State

1976

(in thousands)

State	Number of Persons Under 18 Living in Low Income Families	Percent of All Persons Under 18 Living in Low Income Families
Total	9,582	14.8
Alabama	209	18.4
Alaska	10	7.8
Arizona	139	18.7
Arkansas	147	22.7
California	908	14.6
Colorado	89	11.2
Connecticut	86	9.6
Delaware	19	10.7
District of Columbia	32	17.1
Florida	213	21.3
Georgia	354	22.4
Hawaii	29	10.5
Idaho	33	11.8
Illinois	546	16.1
Indiana	167	10.0
Iowa	75	8.5
Kansas	60	9.2
Kentucky	225	21.4
Louisiana	304	23.9
Maine	51	15.6
Maryland	138	10.8
Massachusetts	183	10.8
Michigan	360	12.5
Minnesota	122	9.8
Mississippi	260	32.8
Missouri	209	15.1
Montana	32	13.6
Nebraska	50	10.6
Nevada	22	11.8
New Hampshire	27	10.8
New Jersey	274	12.5
New Mexico	104	26.1
New York	701	13.8
North Carolina	294	18.3
North Dakota	24	11.7
Ohio	443	13.2
Oklahoma	127	16.0
Oregon	66	9.8
Pennsylvania	452	13.3
Rhode Island	30	11.3
South Carolina	217	23.9
South Dakota	31	14.6
Tennessee	256	20.5
Texas	813	20.6
Utah	42	9.1
Vermont	27	18.2
Virginia	202	13.8
Washington	116	10.8
West Virginia	104	20.2
Wisconsin	149	10.4
Wyoming	11	9.6

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, Current Population Reports, Series P-60, 110, 111, 112, 113, "Money Income and Poverty Status in 1975 of Families and Persons in the United States and the Northeast Region (No. 110); the North Central Region (No. 111); the South Region (No. 112); and the West Region (No. 113) /Spring 1976 Survey of Income and Education/," U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 1978.

(4) Ratio of youth beneficiaries to poor persons under 18 indicates the extent to which a program targeted to poor children is serving that population.

A final standard deals with equity in terms of the levels of service provided to beneficiaries:

(5) Expenditures per beneficiary indicates the level of effort per person served.

In the next section, general findings with respect to these standards of equity are presented for the eight major federal youth programs.

Overview of Findings

The Measures

The principal measure used in this study to address the question of equity in the distribution of federal spending for youth is the coefficient of variation. The coefficient of variation was chosen because it allows comparison of distributions which although measured in the same units are of such different magnitudes that comparison in absolute terms is not sufficiently meaningful.

The coefficient of variation (V) is computed by dividing the standard deviation (S) by the mean ($\overline{X}$):[1]

$$V = \frac{S}{\overline{X}} \quad \text{where} \quad S = \sqrt{\frac{\Sigma X^2}{N} - \left(\frac{\Sigma X}{N}\right)^2}$$

$$\overline{X} = \frac{\Sigma X}{N}$$

ΣX = Sum of Observations

N = Number of Observations

This measures the relative variation among numbers where large and small numbers have equal weight. For example, the coefficient of variation can be used to determine which program's expenditures per beneficiary, Vocational Education or Headstart, are relatively less variable and, therefore, more equitable. The coefficients of variation for the Vocational Education and Headstart programs are .492 and .379, respectively. In this comparison, Vocational Education is more variable because its standard deviation ($20) is 49 percent of its mean ($42) while the Headstart program is less variable with its standard deviation ($643) 38 percent of its average ($1,695). Using a program's range of expenditures, rather than its coefficient of variation, as the principal measure of spending inequalities could lead to incorrect findings. Headstart, for example, with an absolute variation of $3,024 would be found less equitable than Vocational Education with a range of $113, a faulty conclusion. However, one warning is in order. Coefficients of variation do not explain why variations exist such as urban-rural economic differences, age structure of the population, labor force participation rates, race, etc. For example, a large coefficient of variation for Headstart program might simply indicate that in some states labor participation rates are low and, therefore, the need for child care is low.

---

[1] Appendix V presents the means and standard deviations for the eight programs.

The coefficient of variation, then, is a measure of dispersion relative to an average and is independent of the unit or size of measurement. Since the coefficient of variation is not an intuitively meaningful number, ranges are also given as measures of the absolute discrepancies among states. For this study, however, the coefficient of variation is the more significant measure.

Expenditures Per Child and Per Poor Child

The coefficients of variation presented in Table 5 show that on a per child and per poor child basis, federal funding for the eight programs under study is not distributed equitably among the states and, furthermore, that these funding disparities follow no consistent pattern for the two measures.

On a per child basis, Medicaid is the most variable (1.02) followed by Headstart (.909), AFDC (.694), and Food Stamps (.462). All of these programs, however, are designed to provide a specific population with particular assistance or services -- income, medical, nutrition, or child care services to low-income families and individuals. Expenditures per poor child, then, may be a more useful measure of equity of these programs.

Adjusting for distribution among poor children does not substantially improve the relative equity of Medicaid (.916) or AFDC (.684). Both of these programs are designed to reduce funding variations among states by including in their

Table 5

Measures of Equity in Levels of Federal Spending for Youth Among the States 1976

	Coefficient of Variation	Range		
		High	Low	Difference
Expenditures per Child				
AFDC	.694	$39.56	$2.71	$36.85
OASDI	.206	23.55	9.04	14.51
Food Stamps	.462	83.64	12.17	71.47
School Lunch	.358	41.39	10.48	30.91
ESEA - Title I	.347	67.01	13.36	53.65
Vocational Education	.341	9.58	2.11	7.47
Medicaid	1.020	169.20	1.62	167.58
Headstart	.909	49.14	2.98	46.16
Expenditures per Poor Child				
AFDC	.684	$232.43	$9.98	$222.45
OASDI	.243	172.12	50.31	121.81
Food Stamps	.418	700.14	107.42	592.72
School Lunch	.211	226.52	102.99	123.53
ESEA - Title I	.359	562.22	114.78	447.44
Vocational Education	.427	90.28	14.00	76.28
Medicaid	.916	994.07	10.07	984.00
Headstart	.569	159.41	23.49	135.92
Expenditures per Youth Beneficiary				
AFDC	.360	$169.08	$18.65	$150.43
OASDI	.106	337.53	178.78	158.75
Food Stamps	.165	474.86	216.07	258.79
School Lunch	.233	83.62	34.33	49.29
ESEA - Title I	.327	969.86	192.07	777.79
Vocational Education	.492	121.53	8.46	113.07
Medicaid	.408	425.07	6.84	418.23
Headstart	.379	4,098.00	1,074.00	3,024.00

Source: Authors' calculations. See Appendix V for means and standard deviations and Appendix VI for expenditure data.

formulas variables such as population and income. For example, Medicaid's reimbursement rates range from 50 percent to 90 percent depending on a state's per capita income. For AFDC, the federal government pays 5/6ths of the first $18 of monthly benefits plus a variable percentage above this figure. Federal allocations, however, are dependent on benefit levels established by local governments which can cause large spending discrepancies among the states. For example, expenditures per poor child vary from $10 to $994 for Medicaid and $9 to $232 for AFDC, the latter more than a 2,000 percent difference.

Review of another federal program, Food Stamps, indicates that expenditures per child and per poor child vary considerably even for a program with uniform national standards of eligibility and assistance levels. Equity improves very little -- from .462 to .418 -- when adjustment is made for distribution to poor children. Given the inequalities in AFDC, however, the inequality in Food Stamp allocation may not be so surprising since access to AFDC is one of the important mechanisms from which eligible families find out about Food Stamps.

At the other extreme, another federally administered program, OASDI, is the most equitable program on a per child basis (.206) and the second most equitable on a per poor child basis (.243). Expenditures per beneficiary (discussed more fully below), however, may be a more appropriate measure of equity than expenditures per child and per poor child, since OASDI benefits are based on past employment and earnings, and are intended to replace lost income to beneficiaries rather than provide new income to the poor.

The two educational programs studied, Vocational Education and ESEA - Title I, are both funded through formula grants and are relatively more evenly distributed on a per child basis (.341 and .347) than the other programs. However, these two programs are more inequitable on a per poor child basis (.427 and .359). This finding is particularly significant for ESEA - Title I which is designed to reach educationally deprived children.

From the perspective of expenditures per child, School Lunch with a coefficient of .358 is the fourth most equitable program. This program provides low-cost lunches at full or reduced prices, or free to children in school. As with the other formula grant programs, federal allocations depend on local discretion: cash and in-kind benefits are provided on a 3-to-1 matching basis; additional assistance is provided for free or reduced price lunches and for lunches served to children from poor families. On a per poor child basis, variation decreases to .211 making School Lunch the most equitable program for poor children.

When expenditures per poor child are compared to expenditures per child, substantial improvement occurs only for the Headstart (.909 to .569) and School Lunch (.358 to .211) programs. Headstart funds are awarded on a project basis according to need or merit rather than through a formula designed to distribute funds equally. Because the program's target population is disadvantaged children, improvement would be expected in expenditures per poor child since poverty is a proxy for need.

In sum, according to coefficients of variation for per child and per poor child expenditures, there are inequalities in the interstate distribution of federal funds for youth ranging from substantial variation for the major income, medical, and nutrition programs to little relative variation for OASDI and School Lunch.

Expenditures Per Beneficiary

OASDI and Food Stamps are the most equitable programs on an expenditures per beneficiary basis. Little variation is expected for OASDI recipients since OASDI benefits are distributed only to children who are insurance beneficiaries. Given the objectives of the Food Stamp program, however, greater similarity is expected between the poor child (.418) and per beneficiary (.165) coefficients.

A substantial decrease in expenditure variability per recipient also occurs for AFDC and Medicaid. AFDC declines from 68 percent for poor children to approximately 10 percent for beneficiaries while Medicaid decreases from 92 percent to 41 percent. The interesting point is that the federal government has been able to reduce regional discrepancies in AFDC benefits but has been less successful in redressing the expenditure inequalities arising from local Medicaid policies.

The equity of the Headstart program also increases when adjustment is made for beneficiaries, but the variation is relatively high (.379) compared to OASDI, Food Stamps, AFDC, and School Lunch. But given the program's basis for funding and its narrow target population, it is not surprising that expenditures vary widely across states; some programs may be more extensive or more expensive to operate than others.

While six of the eight programs become more equitable on an expenditure per beneficiary basis, two programs, Vocational Education and School Lunch become slightly more inequitable. Furthermore, there does not appear to be any correlation between the scope of these programs and dollars spent. For example, Vocational Education's proportion of outlays exceeds the proportion of recipients in 21 states while for the School Lunch program, the majority of the states' shares of funds is within 1/10th of 1 percent of their share of recipients on a beneficiary basis (see Appendix B). These discrepancies question how School Lunch and Vocational Education funds are being used by the states.

These findings indicate that the majority of the eight programs are more equitable on a beneficiary basis than on a per poor child basis; however, these findings question the extent to which federal grants are designed to channel resources to where need is greatest.

Beneficiaries as a Percent of Children and a Percent of Poor Children

The statistics in Table 6 measure the extent to which the eight programs reach both the general youth population and poor children. These figures reveal serious inequalities in most of the eight programs in the extent to which they reach target populations.

Not surprisingly, programs targeted primarily for poor children show greater inequity in the measure of beneficiaries as a percent of all children than do programs with a broader clientele. The least variation is found in the school lunch program (.227) with OASDI next lowest (.250) and vocational education third (.327). In contrast, Headstart shows a startling degree of inequality (1.1180) and Medicaid, AFDC, Food Stamps and ESEA - Title I also, having coefficients ranging between .429 and .568.

The coefficients of variation fall significantly for some of the programs targeted for poor children when the measure is beneficiaries as a share of poor children. The figure for Headstart falls to .528 and the figure for ESEA - Title I dips to .270. However, there is little change for the Medicaid, AFDC and Food Stamp programs whose coefficients even for this measure range from .407 to .553. Thus, as with the expenditure measures, those three programs evidence significant inequities in their distribution of benefits to their target population.

Table 6

Measures of Equity in Population Served in Youth Programs Among the States, 1976

	Coefficient of Variation	Range		
		High	Low	Difference
Beneficiaries as Percent of Children in the State				
AFDC	.483	37.6%	4.0%	33.7%
OASDI	.250	9.8	3.6	6.2
Food Stamps	.447	32.5	4.2	28.3
School Lunch	.227	65.3	25.8	39.5
ESEA - Title I	.429	15.3	2.7	12.6
Vocational Education	.327	25.7	6.7	19.0
Medicaid	.568	45.2	3.1	42.1
Headstart	1.180	3.8	0.2	3.6
Beneficiaries as Percent of Poor Children in the State				
AFDC	.449	221%	31%	190%
OASDI	.197	69	28	41
Food Stamps	.407	204	36	168
School Lunch	.325	619	170	449
ESEA - Title I	.270	82	23	59
Vocational Education	.545	271	42	229
Medicaid	.553	266	31	235
Headstart	.528	12	1	11

Source: Authors' calculations. See Appendix V for means and standard deviations and Appendix VI for percentage data.

Chapter Four

Efficiency in the Delivery of Services to Youth

This chapter is a direct outgrowth of the previous examination of differences in public spending for youth services between New York City and Houston. That analysis found that public spending per child for youth services was 2.2 times greater in New York than in Houston - $3,095 versus $1,410; and that public spending per poor child was 1.9 times greater in New York City - $12,727 versus $6,707. The purpose of this chapter is to explore the reasons behind the wide variation in spending. In particular, do the additional funds provide services to more of the appropriate youth population or do the added funds simply represent higher input costs required to finance equivalent services?

To provide some preliminary answers to these questions we examine two major areas of youth service spending - income maintenance and nutrition. In the case of income maintenance, the earlier study found spending per poor child (the appropriate target group) to be 4.7 times greater in New York

City than in Houston - $3,360 versus $719. This was the greatest difference between spending levels for any major youth service area. In the case of nutrition, public spending per child was more nearly equal - $163 versus $130 - and public spending per poor child was only about 10 percent higher in New York City - $669 versus $620. Hence these two areas represent a suitable range for exploring the nature of expendituree differences. The findings for each service are are presented in the following two sections.

Nutrition: The Case of School Lunches

The principal public nutrition programs reaching youth are food stamps and the school lunch program. Since food stamps will be considered in the analysis of income maintenance expenditures, it is apprppriate to focus on the school lunch program in this section.

In 1946 Congress, in part motivated by the poor physical condition of many of the young people drafted for military service, passed the National School Lunch Act. The next 20 years saw a three-fold increase in the spending under the program. By 1967 the federal government was spending $338 million annually to feed nearly 19 million school children. While this figure represented nearly 30 percent of the school population, there was mounting concern that many poor children remained undernourished and would benefit by an expansion of the school lunch program.

In 1970 Congress passed amendments to the National School Lunch Act that turned the program into an entitlement. Children were eligible for a free lunch if they came from a family whose income was below the poverty level. For children from families which earned up to 25 percent more than the poverty level, a maximum of 20¢ was to be charged for a lunch. Later this standard was increased to 195 percent and the maximum payment was doubled to 40¢. In addition subsidized meals were to be offered to all children.

In fiscal year 1979-80 the federal government subsidized lunches for 27 million elementary and secondary school children at a cost of $3.1 billion. The amount of the subsidy which the federal government provided to a school for the preparation of a lunch in 1980 was $1.13 for each free lunch it served, $.93 for each reduced price lunch, and 29.5¢ for each full-price lunch for which students pay from 55¢ to $1.20. The actual price of preparing a meal may be higher than those subsidies and local school districts secured additional revenues through state and local taxes and by aditional user charges for other programs such as snacks.

Spending levels for school lunches may vary between areas such as New York and Houston for two principal reasons. First, the unit costs of a lunch under the program may differ, reflecting either greater input costs or lower levels of efficiency. Second, the reach of the program in terms of numbers of children receiving free or reduced price lunches may vary.

Data for these two aspects of the programs show the disparities between New York City and Houston are far greater in terms of program participation than in terms of unit costs. As shown in Table 1, the reported costs of a school lunch was actually 2 cents higher in Houston ($1.27) than in New York City (1.25). However, the higher costs in Houston stem from higher food and donated commodity costs; the labor costs are significantly higher in New York than in Houston: 62¢ versus 50¢. In addition, total costs should not be equated with budgetary expenditures. When donated commodities are excluded from the calculations, the expenditure total for New York City is slightly higher than for Houston - $1.12 versus $1.09.

Table 1

Cost of a School Lunch
New York City and Houston, 1980-81

	New York City	Houston	Ratio
Food	.50	.59	.85
Labor	.62	.50	1.24
Direct Expenditures	1.12	1.09	1.03
Donated Commodities	.13	.18	.72
Total Costs	1.25	1.27	.98

Source: Unpublished data provided by Office of School Food Services, New York City Board of Education; and by Food Service Department, Houston Independent School District.

74

In contrast to this relatively small two percent difference in unit costs, there are substantial differences in the participation rates for school lunch programs between New York City and Houston (see Table 2). Relatively fewer free school lunches are served in Houston than in New York City. Of all the school lunches served, 91 percent are free (as opposed to partially or fully paid by students) in New York City versus 66 percent in Houston. More significantly, the number of free lunches served daily in New York City exceeds by 5 percent the number of children in poor families in that city; in contrast the daily number of free school lunches in Houston is only about three-quarters (77 percent) the number of children in poor families in that city.

Income Maintenance

Both differing levels of participation and differing levels of expenditure per recipient, that is "unit costs," play a significant role in explaining the wide range of expenditures for income maintenance between New York City and Houston. Participation in the program can be gauged by the numbers of families and children receiving benefits and by the share of poor children who receive benefits in each city (see Table 3). In New York City the number of children in families receiving AFDC is 115 percent of the number of children in families with incomes below the poverty line; in contrast, for Houston (using AFDC figures for Harris County) the equivalent figures are 33,512 children who represent just 43 percent of the children in low income families. Thus the rate of participation in New York City is nearly 2.7 times greater than in Houston.

Table 2

Participation in School Lunch Programs
New York City and Houston, 1980-81

	New York City	Houston
Average Daily Participation	526,823	90,535
Free lunches	479,409	59,753
Reduced price lunches	26,341	8,148
Fully paid lunches	21,072	22,634
Low Income Population Under Age 18	456,453	77,325
Free Lunches as a Share of Poor Youth	105%	77%

Sources: Unpublished data supplied by Office of Food Scool Services, New York City Board of Education; and by Food Services Department, Houston Independent School District; population figures are for 1976, based on unpublished tabulations from the Surevy of Income and Education.

Table 3

Participation in the AFDC Program
New York City and Houston, 1980

	New York City	Houston
AFDC Recipients		
Total	762,224	46,010
Children under age 18	527,007	33,512
Population Under Age 18 in Low Income Families (1976)	456,453	77,325
AFDC Child Recipients as a Percent of Poor Youth	115%	43%

Sources: Office of Research and Statistics, Social Security Administration, U.S. Department of Health nad Human Services, Public Assistance Recipients and Cash Payments by State and County - February 1980, SSA Publication No. 13-11921, December, 1980; and unpublished data from the 1976 Survey of Income and Education.

7

The concept of "unit costs" takes on a special meaning when applied to income transfer programs. Since cash is simply being transferred, rather than goods or labor being purchased to produce a service, the level of expenditure per person or per family could be equated with unit costs. However, a more refined approach relates levels of cash benefits to the cost of providing families and children with an adequate minimum standard of living.

The cost of maintaining minimal adequate standard of living in major metropolitan areas of the Unted States has been estimated annually by the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics. The family for which these budgets are estimated consists of a 38 year old husband employed full time, a non-working wife, and two children. It is assumed that the family rents its shelter and that the rent excludes heating fuel and utilities, and household insurance; that food is purchased in accord with a nutritionally adequate diet established by the U.S. Department of Agriculture; that only half the low income families own their own cars in New York City while 65 percent do in Houston (and the remainder rely exlcusively on public transportation); and that medical care costs include hospitals and medical insurance as well as dental, eye care and prescriptions.

Table 4 presents these official estimates of the lower level living costs for a family of four in New York and Houston. In 1979 the costs were seven percent higher in New York than in Houston. Not all items in the budget were more costly in New York: the Houston family had to pay more for the same level of transportation and medical services, and for clothing.

While New York City is a more expensive place to live than Houston, the gap for lower level living standards in the two cities has been narrowing. An examination of the lower level family budgets in both places in 1976 and

Table 4

Annual Costs of a Lower Level Budget for a Four-Person Family in New York City and Houston
Autumn, 1976 and 1979

	1976			1979			Percent Change in Budgets 1976-79	
	New York City	Houston	Ratio	New York City	Houston	Ratio	New York City	Houston
Total Budget	$10,835	$9,532	1.14	$12,949	$12,100	1.07	19.5%	26.9%
Total Family Consumption	8,645	7,975	1.08	10,391	10,103	1.03	20.2	26.7
Food	3,346	2,924	1.14	4,195	3,792	1.11	25.4	29.7
Housing	2,064	1,821	1.13	2,410	2,200	1.10	16.8	20.8
Transportation	670	720	0.93	847	913	0.93	26.4	26.8
Clothing	768	788	0.97	791	923	0.86	3.0	17.1
Personal Care	280	276	1.01	335	364	0.92	19.6	31.9
Medical Care	993	983	1.01	1,209	1,377	0.88	21.8	40.1
Other Family Consumption	524	463	1.13	604	534	1.13	15.3	15.3
Other Items	465	445	1.05	544	535	1.02	17.0	20.2
Social Security	662	556	1.19	824	742	1.11	24.5	33.5
Personal Income Taxes	1,063	556	1.91	1,190	720	1.65	11.9	29.5

Source: U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, "Autumn 1979 Urban Family Budgets and Comparative Indexes for Selected Urban Areas," USDL 80-278, April 30, 1980; and "Autumn 1976 Urban Family Budgets and Comparative Indexes for Selected Urban Areas," USDL 77-369, April 27, 1977.

1979 shows every component of the budget becoming more costly at a more rapid rate in Houston. Whereas the total budget in New York City was 14 percent higher than in Houston in 1976, that margin was cut in half by 1979. The largest increase in expenses for a Houston family was for medical care, which soared by 40 percent from 1976 to 1979.

Modifications are required to make the Bureau of Labor Statistics lower level budget appropriate for the typical AFDC family of one non-working adult and three children. The Community Council of Greater New York has developed a methodology for making these adjustments. The BLS budget is modified to exclude rent which is covered in a separate shelter allowance for AFDC families, to exclude medical care costs which are covered by Medicaid for AFDC families, to exclude social security and personal income taxes which do not apply to the AFDC family's unearned income. The modified budget also excludes a share of expenses for alcoholic beverages, tobacco, reading and recreation, food away from home and automobile costs, since welfare families are not expected to purchase these items. The resulting figure is multiplied by 0.88 to adjust for the fact that the family has one adult and three children rather than two adults and two children. Using this approach, a lower level living costs for a welfare family can be estimated at $5,459 annually in New York City and $5,517 in Houston (see Table 5). This suggests that the "unit cost" of providing a minimal adequate living standard is virtually equal (99%) in Houston and New York City.

However, while the costs of a minimally adequate standard of living are nearly equal in the two cities, the AFDC benefit packages are far from equal. In 1979 New York City families received basic welfare grants and food stamp bonuses which totaled $4,452 annually or 81.5 percent of the BLS modi-

Table 5

Basic Publis Assistance Benefits Relative to a Modified Bureau of Labor Statistics Lower Level of Living Family Budget New York City and Houston, 1979

	New York City	Houston	Ratio
Modified Bureau of Labor Statistics Budget for a Family of Four	$5,459	$5,517	.99
Basic Welfare Grant for a Family of Four			
Total	4,452	4,128	1.08
Basic AFDC Payment	3,096	1,680	-
Food Stamp Bonus	1,356	2,448	-
Ratio of Welfare Grant to Bureau of Labor Statistics Budget	0.815	0.748	-

Source: Basic welfare grants are maximum amounts reported in U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, AFDC Standards for Basic Needs, July 1979, Table 5; Food Stamp bonus amounts were calculated based on formulas supplied by U.S. Department of Agriculture, Family and Nutrition Programs, Program Development Division, Policy and Regulations Section; BLS budgewt amounts were modified using method developed by Community Council of Greater New York, Program Planning Information Department.

fied budget; in Houston these benefits totalled $4,128 annually or 74.8 percent of the BLS budget. Thus public expenditures in Houston were less because of both lower expenditures (but similar "costs") per recipient and because of lower rates of participation in the programs.

Appendix I

Allocation and Classification of Histfund Account Expenditures - 1964, 1970, 1976, 1980

The starting point for all our estimates of expenditures for children and youth is the Office of Management and Budget's "Histfund" accounts. These are budget accounting units that have been made uniform over time. A functional analysis of the Histfund accounts was the source document from which our analysis began.

Reviewing all Histfund accounts (a total of 1140) yielded 83 accounts which in some way funded services for children and youth. These accounts were divided and classified in three ways - by function, by share expended for youth and children, and by nature of service delivery.

The functional classification used in this study is a modification of OMB's functional classification. We identified ten functional areas which relate to the needs of children and youth: community development, health, housing, income, child care, education, employment, justice, nutrition and recreation.

These functional areas correspond to the OMB's functional classifications except that OMB does not separate child care from other social services; does not separate housing from general income security programs; does not separate nutrition programs from general income security programs; and does not identify recreational programs as a separate category. Accordingly we classified Histfund account numbers 050400, 050500 and 050700 as child care; Histfund accounts 099400 and 099500 as housing programs; Histfund account numbers 023800, 023900, 024000, 024100, 024300, and 024400 as nutrition programs; Histfund account numbers 053800, 025300, 057800, 058100, 057600 and 054700 as recreational programs. In addition, ACTION (110700) and Community Services Administration (113400) expenditures were classified as community development rather than OMB's social services; the youth conservation corps (024900) was classified as an employment program rather than as a natural resources conservation program; the veterans administration medical care program (107400) was classified as a health program rather than as a veteran benefits program; and five additional veterans aid programs (106500, 106900, 109000, 109200, 107000) were classified as income maintenance rather than veteran benefits programs. All other functional classifications are those used by OMB.

Within these functional groups each Histfund account was analyzed to identify the share of expenditures allocated to services for children and youth. This analysis often involves disaggregating Histfund accounts into program elements. This disaggregation was based on information contained in the relevant budget documents. Since Histfund refers to actual outlays, budget documents reporting outlays for previous years were used to analyze the composition of Histfund outlays. For 1964 see U. S. Bureau of the Budget, The Budget of the United States Government, 1966: Appendix, (Washington: U. S. Government Printing Office 1965); for 1970 see U. S. Bureau of the Budget, The Budget of the United States Government, 1972: Appendix, (Washington: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1971); for 1976 see U. S. Office of Management and Budget, The Budget of the United States Government, 1978: Appendix, (Washington: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1977). The share of expenditures allocated to children and youth was generally based on service statistics provided by the administering agency and the precise method of allocation is explained more fully for each Histfund account in the sections which follow.

Share of Histfund accounts (and those subprogram where appropriate) allocated to children and youth were also classified by the nature of service delivery - direct services to children (DS), services to children as part of families (PF), services to children as part of a larger population (LP), and public or quasi-public goods with a direct benefit to children (PG). The general logic of these distinctions is explained in the text. The way in which each Histfund account was classified is explained in the sections which follow.

Allocation and Classification of Histfund Account Expenditures,

1964, 1970, 1976, 1980

CHILD CARE AND SOCIAL SERVICES

Grants to States for Social Services and Child Welfare
Human Development Services

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

ACTION
Appalachian Regional Development Program
Community Planning and Development Grants
Community Service Program
Comprehensive Planning Grants
Operation of Indian Programs

EDUCATION

American Printing House for the Blind
Educational Development
Education for Handicapped
Elementary and Secondary Education
Emergency School Aid
Human Development Services
Indian Education
Library Resources
Library and Learning Resources
National Foundation for the Arts and Humanities
National Endowment for the Humanities
National Institute of Education
Occupational, Vocational and Adult Education
Operation of Indian Programs
Public Broadcasting Fund
Rehabilitation Services and Handicapped Education
Research and Related Activities - NIE
Salaries and Expenses, National Gallery of Art
School Assistance in Federally Affected Areas
School Improvement Programs

Science and Education Administration Extension Activities
Smithsonian Institution, Salaries and Expenses
Special Projects and Training

EMPLOYMENT

Community Services Program
Employment and Training Assistance
Job Opportunities Program
Temporary Employment Assistance
Unemployment Trust Fund (Training and Employment)
Work Incentives
Youth Conservation Corps

HEALTH

Alcohol, Drub Abuse & Mental Health Administration (ADAMHA)
Center for Disease Control - Preventive Health Services
Federal Hospital Insurance Trust Fund (HI)
Federal Supplementary Medical Insurance Trust Fund (SMI)
Grants to States for Medicaid Payments
Health Services
Indian Health Facilities
Indian Health Services
Medical Care - Veterans Administration
National Institute of Child Health and Human Development
St. Elizabeth's Hospital

HOUSING

Payments for Operation of Low Income Housing
Subsidized Housing Programs

INCOME

Assistance Payments
Civil Service Retirement and Disability Fund
Cuban Refugee Assistance
Federal Disability Insurance Trust Fund

- Federal Old Age & Survivors Insurance Trust Fund
- Federal Unemployment Benefits and Allowances
- Grants to States for Unemployment Insurance & Employment Services
- Judicial Survivors Annuity Fund
- National Life Insurance Fund
- Payments to States for Child Support, Title IVB
- Railroad Retirement Account
- Special Benefits for Disabled Coal Miners
- Supplementary Security Income (SSI)
- Unemployment Trust Fund
- Veterans Compensation and Benefits
- Veterans Insurance and Indemnities
- Veterans Readjustment Benefits
- U.S. Government Life Insurance Fund

JUSTICE

- Law Enforcement Assistance Administration (LEAA)

NUTRITION

- Child Nutrition Programs
- Food Donations Program
- Food Stamp Program
- Special Milk Fund
- Special Supplementary Food Program (WIC)

RECREATION

- Bureau of Land Management Development and Operation of Recreation Facilities
- Forest Service Construction and Operation of Recreation Facilities
- JFK Center for the Performing Arts
- National Park Service Planning, Development and Operation of Recreation Facilities
- Operation of the National Park Service
- Recreational and Fish and Wildlife Facilities
- Urban Parks and Recreation Grants

SUMMARY TABLES OF EXPENDITURES FOR YOUTH BY FUNCTION

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Grants to States for Social Services and Child Welfare

HIST # 050500

This account existed in 1964, 1970, 1976, and 1980.

For 1964 the account was subdivided into two programs. For the first, child welfare services, 100% of the funds were allocated for youth and classified as DS. For the second--research, training and demonstration in child welfare--based on budget data it was estimated that 37% of the funds could be allocated for youth. This sum was classified as PG.

For 1970 the account was subdivided into three programs. For social services, 33% of the funds were allocated for youth based on their share of the recipients of social services under Titles XX and IV-B in 1976 reported in Social Services USA, January-March, 1976 [National Center for Social Statistics, DHEW, Publication No. (SRS) 77-03300]. This sum was classified as LP. For the two other programs--state and local training and research and training--based on budget data it was estimated that 35.7% of the account could be allocated for youth. These sums were classified as PG.

For 1976 the account was subdivided into five programs. For child welfare services, 100% of the account was allocated for youth and classified as DS. For two programs--social services and state and local training--33% of the funds were allocated for youth based on their share of the recipients of social services under Titles XX and IV-B reported in Social Services USA, January-March, 1976 [National Center for Social Statistics, DHEW, Publication No. (SRS) 77-03300]. The sum for social services was classified as LP and the sum for state and local training was classified as PG. For the final two programs--research and evaluation and training projects--71% of the funds were allocated for youth based on their share of the recipients of aid to dependent children reported in Public Assistance Statistics, December, 1976 [DHEW, Social and Rehabilitative Services, DHEW

Publication No. (SRS) 77-03100, NCSS Report A-2 (12/76)]. These sums were classified as PG.

For 1980 the account was subdivided into three programs. For Social Services 32.1% of the funds were allocated for youth based on their share of recipients of social services under Titles IV-B, IV A/C and XX as reported in Interim Report of First Quarter FY 1978 Social Services USA Oct.- Dec. '77. [Office of Human Development Services, DHEW Publication No. (OHDS) 79-02020]. This sum was classified as LP. For child welfare services 100% of the fund accounts were allocated for youth and classified as DS. For the state and local training program 70% of the funds were allocated for youth based on the share of AFDC recipients for FY 1979 who were children. Data were supplied by the U. S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Division of Family Assistance Services. This sum was classified as PG.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

SUMMARY TABLE

	Youth Services					
	DS	PF	LP	PG	Other	Total
			1964			
Child Welfare Services	26,773	-	-	-	-	26,773
All other	-	-	-	7,338	2,278	3,616
TOTAL	26,773	-	-	7,338	2,278	30,389
			1970			
Social Services	-	-	177,364	-	360,104	537,468
All other	-	-	-	13,799	24,797	38,596
TOTAL	-	-	177,364	13,799	384,901	576,064
			1976			
Child Welfare Services	52,535	-	-	-	-	52,535
Social Services	-	-	703,590	-	1,428,502	2,132,092
State & Local Training	-	-	-	19,587	39,766	59,353
All other	-	-	-	10,307	4,210	14,517
TOTAL	52,535	-	703,590	29,894	1,472,478	2,258,497
			1980			
Social Services	-	-	896,688	-	1,896,732	2,793,420
Child Welfare Services	58,809	-	-	-	-	58,809
State & Local Training	-	-	-	61,749	26,464	88,213
TOTAL	58,909	-	896,688	61,749	1,923,196	2,940,442

Human Development Services

HIST # 050400
050700

These accounts existed in 1964, 1970, 1976, and 1980. In each year the two accounts were combined in order to make programmatic breakdowns corresponding to categories in the original Federal budget documents.

For 1964, based on budget data, the account was subdivided into two programs. For the vocational rehabilitation program, 13.5% of the funds were allocated for youth based on the percentage of rehabilitated individuals under 18 years as presented in the "Characteristics of Clients Rehabilitated in FY 1967-76 in Federal-State Vocational Rehabilitation Programs," report prepared by the Division of Program Data and Analysis, Rehabilitation Services Administration, DHEW. This sum was classified as LP. The Welfare Administration program was subdivided into seven subprograms. For the Office of Aging subprogram and the foreign research and training subprogram no funds were allocated for youth. For the juvenile delinquency and youth offenses subprogram, all funds were allocated for youth and classified as DS. For the four remaining subprograms, 75% of the funds were allocated for children based on the share of welfare recipients who were children. For the Bureau of Family Services and the Childrens Bureau, the sums were classified as PF; for the research and demonstration and the Office of the Commissioner subprograms, the sums were classified as PG.

For 1970, the two accounts were subdivided into five programs. (1) The rehabilitation services program was divided into six subprograms. For four of the subprograms dealing with traditional rehabilitation services the method of allocation and classification was the same as for 1964. For the two subprograms targeted for developmental disabilities, 26.7% of the funds were allocated for youth based on data supplied by the Developmental Disabilities Bureau. These sums were classified as LP. (2) The programs for the aging were not allocated

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

for youth except for the foster grandparents subprogram which was allocated for youth and classified DS. (3) Youth delinquency program funds were allocated 100% to youth with program development funds classified DS and technical assistance funds classified PG. (4) Funds for research and training were allocated to youth based on their share of the general population. This sum was classified PG. (5) Salaries and expenses for administration were allocated and classified in proportion to all other account funds.

For 1976, the account was subdivided into seven programs. (1) The youth development program was allocated 100% for youth with the runaway youth subprogram classified as DS and the research subprogram classified as PG. (2) No programs for the aging funds were allocated for youth. (3) The rehabilitation services program was allocated and classified in the same manner as 1970 except that 1976 figures indicated that 13.4% of funds should be allocated for youth. (4) The developmental disabilities program was allocated and classified in the same manner as for 1970 except that 1976 data indicated that 27.5% of funds should be allocated for youth. (5) Program funds for native Americans were allocated 50% for youth and classified LP. (6) For the White House Conference on the Handicapped, 6% of the funds were allocated for youth based on the share of handicapped persons under 18. This sum was classified PG. (7) Salaries and expenses for program administration were allocated and classified in proportion to all other account funds.

For 1980, the account was subdivided into seven programs. (1) The runaway youth program was allocated 100% for youth and classified as DS. (2) No funds of the Administration on Aging were allocated for youth. (3) For the rehabilitation services program 11.1% of the funds were allocated for youth based on the share of youth rehabilitated in the program during 1978. Data were supplied by the same source as 1976 and classified in the same manner. (4) For the developmental disabilities program 1.8% of the funds were allocated youth based on the same source as earlier years. (5) Funds for National Institute of Handicapped Research were allocated 6% for youth based on the share of handicapped children in school from The Condition of Education (U. S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, National Center for Education Statistics, 1978). This sum was classified as PG. (6) Program funds for the Native American program were allocated on the same basis as for earlier years. (7) Salaries and expenses for program administration were allocated and classified in proportion to all other account funds.

SUMMARY TABLE

	Youth Services					
	DS	PF	LP	PG	Other	Total
			1964			
Vocational Rehabilitation	-	-	16,222	-	103,939	120,161
Welfare Administration						
Juvenile Delinquency	6,480	-	-	-	-	6,480
Bureau of Family Services	-	3,240	-	-	1,080	4,320
Childrens Bureau	-	2,414	-	-	805	3,219
Research & Demonstration	-	-	-	1.043	347	1,390
Office of the Commissioner	-	-	-	578	192	770
All other	-	-	-	-	1,238	1,238
TOTAL	6,480	5,659	16,222	1,621	107,596	137,578
			1970			
Rehabilitation	-	-	54,244	-	347,568	401,812
Services & Developmental Disabilities	-	-	9,453	-	25,951	35,404
Office of the Aging						
Foster Grandparents	7,868	-	-	-	-	7,868
All other	-	-	-	-	16,297	16,297
Youth Development & Delinquency Prevention						
Program Development	6,744	-	-	-	-	6,744
Technical Assistance	-	-	-	1,686	-	1,686
Research & Training	-	-	-	20,696	39,997	60,693
Salaries & Expenses	813	-	3,567	1,253	25,838	31,471
TOTAL	15,425	-	67,264	23,635	455,651	561,975

SUMMARY TABLE

	Youth Services					
	DS	PF	LP	PG	Other	Total
1976						
Youth Development						
Runaway Youth	6,439	-	-	-	-	6,439
Research & Demonstration	-	-	-	234	-	234
Rehabilitation Services	-	-	102,054	-	659,544	761,598
Developmental Disabilities	-	-	12,632	-	33,303	45,935
Special Prog. for Native Americans	-	-	15,804	-	15,803	31,607
White House Conference on the Handicapped	-	-	-	58	914	972
All other	-	-	-	-	248,823	248,823
Salaries & Expenses for Program Administration	577	-	17,497	769	77,291	96,134
TOTAL	7,016	-	147,987	1,061	1,035,678	1,191,742
1980						
Runaway Youth	12,048	-	-	-	-	12,048
Rehabilitation Services	-	-	50,820	-	407,017	457,837
Developmental Disabilities	-	-	325	-	59,917	60,242
Nat'l Institute of Handicapped Research	-	-	-	723	11,325	12,048
Admin. for Native Americans	-	-	18,073	-	18,073	36,146
Salaries & Expenses	-	-	3,494	-	56,748	60,242
All Other					566,272	566,272
TOTAL	12,048	-	72,712	723	1,119,352	1,204,835

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

ACTION HIST = 110700

This account existed in 1976 and 1980. Based on budget data, in 1976 the account was subdivided into five programs: VISTA, service learning programs (SLP), older Americans volunteers programs (OAVP), special volunteer programs (SVP), and program support (PS).

For VISTA, the share allocated to children and youth was based on the share of children in the general population. This share was classified as PG.

For SLP data supplied by the Office of VISTA in ACTION indicated that 9% of the SLP was identified as LP. For the balance of SLP program funds, a share was allocated on the basis of youth as a share of the total population and classified as PG.

For OAVP, data supplied by the Office of Older Americans Volunteer Programs in ACTION indicated that 59% of the funds were devoted to the Foster Grandparents Program. This share was classified LP.

For SVP a share was allocated to children and youth based on their share of the population. This amount was classified PC.

For PS funds were allocated to children and youth and among types of services in proportion to the aggregate amounts for the other four programs in this hist fund account.

In 1980, the account was divided into four accounts.

For VISTA, the share allocated to children and youth was 28.4% based on the share of children in the general population. This share was classified as PG.

For OAVP, data supplied by the Office of Older Americans Volunteer programs is ACTION indicated that 56% of funds were devoted to Foster Grandparents Program. This share was allocated to LP.

The rest of the funds were allocated based on youth as a share of the population and classified as LP.

SUMMARY TABLE

1976	Youth Services					
	DS	PF	LP	PG	Other	Total
VISTA	-	-	-	2,244	21,801	24,045
SLP	-	-	650	1,992	4,582	7,224
OAVP	-	-	31,171	-	21,662	52,833
SVP	-	-	-	1,045	2,405	3,450
PS	-	-	7,298	1,223	11,750	20,271
TOTAL	-	-	39,119	6,504	62,200	107,823

1980	DS	PF	LP	PG	Other	Total
VISTA	-	-	-	8,540	21,532	30,072
OAVP	-	-	45,162	-	35,485	80,647
Citizen Participation & Volunteer Program	-	-	397	-	970	1,367
Program Support	-	-	6,988	-	17,616	24,604
TOTAL	-	-	52,547	8,540	75,603	136,690

Appalachian Regional Development Program HIST # 009700

This account existed only in 1970, 1976, and 1980.

In 1970, based on budget data, the account was subdivided into ten programs. Four of the programs were unrelated to services for children and youth. For the vocational education facilities program, 67% of the funds were allocated to children and youth based the share of enrollees under 18 years old as estimated by the Appalachian Regional Commission's (ARC) Education Division. This sum was classified as LP.

For five additional programs—Appalachian development highway system, demonstration health projects, supplements to federal grants-in-aid program and the research and local demonstration program--35.7% of the funds were allocated to children and youth based on the share of the Appalachian region's population who were under 18 in 1970. These sums were classified as LP.

In 1976, the hist fund account was divided into three programs. Allocation and classification of the Appalachian development highway system was made on the same basis as in 1970. For the other two programs, 22% of the funds were allocated to children and youth based on estimates supplied by ARC's Education and Child Development Divisions. These sums were classified as LP and PG.

In 1980, 35.7% of funds for Highway Development were allocated for children and youth based on ARC Education Division estimates and classified in LP. The youth share for the remainder of the funds was 22% based on estimates supplied by ARC's Education and Child Development Divisions. The share for Area Redevelopment was classified as LP; the other two were PG.

Appalachian Regional Development Program HIST # 009700

SUMMARY TABLE

	Youth Services					
	DS	PF	LP	PG	Other	Total
			1970			
Appalachian Development Highway System	-	-	49,507	-	89,169	138,676
Demostration Health Projects	-	-	1,724	-	3,105	4,829
Vocational Educational Facilities	-	-	7,649	-	3,939	11,588
Research & Local Demostrations	-	-	1,310	-	2,360	3,670
Supplements to Grants-in-Aid	-	-	9,033	-	16,268	25,301
All other	-	-	-	-	9,078	9,078
TOTAL	-	-	69,223	-	123,919	193,142
			1976			
Appalachian Development Hignway System	-	-	66,033	-	118,934	184,967
Area Development Programs	-	-	27,186	-	96,019	123,205
Research & Local Demostrations	-	-	-	3,637	6,551	10,188
TOTAL	-	-	93,219	3,637	221,504	318,160

(Summary Table, Cont. . .)

(Summary Table, cont.)

	Youth Services					
	DS	PF	LP	PG	Other	Total
			1980			
Appalachian Development Highway System	-	-	63,358	-	114,114	177,472
Area Redevelopment	-	-	24,485	-	86,811	111,296
Research & Local District Program	-	-	-	1,323	4,693	6,016
Other				1,323	4,693	6,016
TOTAL	-	-	87,843	2,646	210,311	300,800

Community Planning & Development Grants HIST # 101900

This account existed in 1976 and 1980. For both years the share allocated to children and youth was based on youth as a share of the total population and classified as PG.

SUMMARY TABLE

	Youth Services					
	DS	PF	LP	PG	Other	Total
1976						
TOTAL	-	-	-	297,785	685,004	982,789
1980						
TOTAL	-	-	-	1,073,236	2,705,764	3,779,000

Community Services Program HIST #

This account existed only in 1970, 1976, and 1980.

For 1970 the hist fund account was divided into two programs. The research, development and evaluation program was not classified as a service to children and youth. For the community action program, 80% of the funds were allocated to children and youth based on data describing program participants in Summary of 1975 CAA Sample Survey (Community Services Administration, November 1976). This sum was classified as LP. In 1976 the total hist fund account was allocated and classified based on the same data and in the same manner as in 1970.

For 1980, based on budget data, this account was subdivided into nine programs. All of the funds for youth recreation and summer employment programs were allocated for youth and classified as DS. For Community Economic Development, Food and Nutrition, CETA, Energy Conservation and State Economic Opportunity offices, CAAs, and Research and Development, 40% of the funds were allocated for youth based on the share of youth under 18 in poverty families. (U.S. Bureau of the Census, Current Population Reports, Series P-60, No. 120, November, 1979.) This sum was classified as LP. Funds for older persons were not classified as a service to children and youth.

SUMMARY TABLE

	Youth Services					
	DS	PF	LP	PG	Other	Total
			1970			
Research Development & Evaluation	-	-	-	-	44,147	44,147
Community Action	-	-	553,308	-	138,327	691,635
TOTAL	-	-	553,308	-	182,474	735,782
			1976			
TOTAL	-	-	369,842	-	92,462	462,304

1980

	Youth Services					
	DS	PF	LP	PG	Other	Total
Youth Recreation	56,857	-	-	-	-	56,857
Summer Youth Employment	11,633	-	-	-	-	11,633
Youth Recreation	20,694	-	-	-	-	20,694
Community Economic Development	-	-	56,775	-	85,162	141,937
Food and Nutrition	-	-	37,420	-	56,129	93,549
CETA	-	-	218	-	327	545
Energy Conservation	-	-	232,260	-	348,391	580,651
State EOC offices	-	-	15,226	-	22,839	38,065
CAAs	-	-	500,285	-	752,954	1253,239
Research Development	-	-	2,064	-	3,097	5,161
Older Persons	-	-	-	-	27,269	27,269
TOTAL	89,184	-	844,248	-	1,296,168	2229,600

Comprehensive Planning Grants HIST # 101800

This account existed in 1964, 1970, 1976, and 1980. For all four years, the children and youth shares were based on their share of the total population. These sums were classified as PG.

SUMMARY TABLE

	Youth Services					
	DS	PF	LP	PG	Other	Total
1964	-	-	-	8,143	14,167	22,310
1970	-	-	-	14,367	27,765	42,132
1976	-	-	-	37,247	85,679	122,926
1980	-	-	-	15,904	40,096	56,000

Operation of Indian Programs

HIST # 059900

This account existed in 1964, 1970, 1976, and 1980.

In 1964 the hist fund account covered nine programs. The program for development of arts and crafts which involved the production of goods for sale was not viewed as a service to children. For all the remaining programs, 44% of the funds was allocated for children based on the share of the Indian population under 18 in 1972 as estimated by the U.S. Department of Interior, Bureau of Indian Affairs. This sum was classified as PG.

For 1970, the method and basis of allocation and the expenditure classifica- was the same as for 1964.

For 1976 the Hist fund account consisted of five programs. In each case the share allocated to children and youth was 39% based on 1977 estimates of the age distribution of the Indian population prepared by the Bureau of Indian Affairs. For four of the five programs the expenditures for children and youth were classified as PG. The youth share of the Indian services program was classified as LP.

In 1980, the Hist fund account consisted of four programs. In each case the share allocated to children and youth was 44% based on the share of Indian population under the age of 18 from the 1977 estimate of the Indian population on and adjacent to reservations supplied by the Bureau of Indian Affairs. The youth share of Indian services program was classified as LP; all others as PG.

Operation of Indian Programs KIST # 059900

SUMMARY TABLE

	Youth Services					
	DS	PF	LP	PG	Other	Total
			1964			
Development of Arts & Crafts	-	-	-	-	365	365
All other	-	-	-	16,415	20,850	37,265
TOTAL	-	-	-	16,415	21,215	37,530
			1970			
Development of Arts & Crafts	-	-	-	-	573	573
All other	-	-	-	25,006	31,826	56,832
TOTAL	-	-	-	25,006	32,399	57,405
			1976			
Indian Services	-	-	39,579	-	61,463	101,042
All other	-	-	-	64,295	100,564	164,859
TOTAL	-	-	39,579	64,295	162,027	265,901
			1980			
Indian Services	-	-	79,449	-	101,118	180,567
All other	-	-	-	101,118	128,696	229,814
TOTAL	-	-	79,449	101,118	229,814	410,381

HIST # 05000

American Printing House for the Blind

This account existed in 1964, 1970, 1976, and 1980. In all four years, 100% of the program funds were allocated to children and youth and classified as DS.

SUMMARY TABLE

	Youth Services					
	DS	PF	LP	PG	Other	Total
1964	775	-	-	-	-	775
1970	1,404	-	-	-	-	1,404
1976	2,407	-	-	-	-	2,407
1980	4,349	-	-	-	-	4,349

Educational Development HIST # 047800

This account existed in 1964, 1970, 1976, and 1980. For 1964, the share allocated to children and youth was based on youth as a share of the total population. This sum was classified as LP.

For 1970, based on budget data, the account was subdivided into three programs. For the personnel training and development program, the share allocated to children and youth was based on youth as a share of the total population. This sum was classified as LP. For special programs serving children in low income areas, 100% of the funds were allocated to youth and classified as DS. For planning and evaluation, funds were allocated to children in proportion to the aggregate amounts for the other programs in this hist fund account. This sum was classified as DS.

For 1976, 100% of the program funds were allocated to youth and classified as DS.

For 1980, 100% of the program funds were allocated to youth and classified as DS.

SUMMARY TABLE

	Youth Services					
	DS	PF	LP	PG	Other	Total
			1964			
TOTAL	-	-	2,805	-	4,881	7,686
			1970			
Personnel Training	-	-	35,231	-	68,089	103,320
Sp.Prog: Serving Child. in Low Income Areas	62,391	-	-	-	-	62,391
Planning & Evaluation	251	-	-	-	415	666
TOTAL	62,642	-	35,232	-	68,504	166,377
			1976			
TOTAL	9,066	-	-	-	-	9,066
			1980			
TOTAL	500	-	-	-	-	500

Education for Handicapped HIST # 047600

This account existed in 1964, 1970, 1976, and 1980. For 1964, 6% of the account funds was allocated to children and youth based on the share of all children enrolled in school in Spring, 1978 who were handicapped as reported in The Condition of Education (U. S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, National Center for Education Statistics, 1978). This sum was classified as PG.

For 1970, based on budget data, the account was subdivided into five programs. For the state grant programs and the early childhood projects, 100% of the funds were allocated to youth and classified as DS. For the three additional programs--teacher education recruitment, research and innovation, and planning and evaluation--the funds were allocated and classified based on the same data and in the same manner as for 1964.

For 1976, based on budget data, the account was subdivided into six programs. For four programs--state assistance, special population program, regional vocational education and post-secondary education, and innovation and development--100% of the account funds were allocated for children and youth. These funds were classified as DS. For the two additional programs--media and resource services and special education and manpower development--the funds were allocated based on the same data as for 1964 and classified as LP.

For 1980, based on budget data, the account was subdivided into five programs. For three programs - state assistance, special population program, and innovation and development - 100% of the account funds were allocated for children and youth. These funds were classified as DS. For the two additional programs - media and resources services and special education personnel development - 6% of the account funds were allocated for youth based on the share of handicapped children in school from data in The Condition of Education (1978). These sums were classified as LP.

Education for the Handicapped HIST # 047600

SUMMARY TABLE

	Youth Services					
	DS	PF	LP	PG	Other	Total
			1964			
TOTAL	-	-	-	153	2,397	2,550
			1970			
State Grants	27,207	-	-	-	-	27,207
Early Childhood	2,768	-	-	-	-	2,768
All others	-	-	-	2,947	46,167	49,114
TOTAL	29,975	-	-	2,947	46,167	79,089
			1976			
State Assistance	87,499	-	-	-	-	87,499
Sp. Population Program	22,592	-	-	-	-	22,592
Regional Vocational Education	957	-	-	-	-	957
Innovation & Development	7,657	-	-	-	-	7,657
All others	-	-	4,365	-	68,372	72,737
TOTAL	118,703	-	4,365	-	68,372	191,442
			1980			
State Assistance	717,934	-	-	-	-	717,934
Sp. Population Program	15,779	-	-	-	-	15,779
Innovation & Development	7,889	-	-	-	-	7,889
Media & Resources Serv.	-	-	947	-	14,832	15,779
Sp. Ed. Personnel Dev.	-	-	1,893	-	29,665	31,558
TOTAL	741,602	-	2,840	-	44,497	788,939

Elementary and Secondary Education HIST # 047400

This account existed in 1964, 1970, 1976, and 1980. In all four years, 100% of the account funds were allocated to children and youth. These sums were classified as DS.

SUMMARY TABLE

	Youth Services					
	DS	PF	LP	PG	Other	Total
			1964			
TOTAL	69,841	-	-	-	-	69,841
			1970			
TOTAL	1,472,264	-	-	-	-	1,472,264
			1976			
TOTAL	2,166,989	-	-	-	-	2,166,989
			1980			
TOTAL	3,409,034	-	-	-	-	3,409,034

Emergency School Aid HIST # 047300

This account existed only in 1976 and 1980. For 1976, based on budget data, the account was subdivided into three programs. For two programs--national competition projects and state apportioned projects--100% of the account funds were allocated to children and youth. These sums were classified as DS.

For the remaining program, training and advisory services, 23% of the account was allocated to youth based on youth enrolled in school as a share of the general population. This sum was classified as PG. School enrollment data were reported in The Condition of Education (U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, National Center for Social Statistics, 1978, Table 66) and population data were reported in Current Population Reports (U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census Series P-25, Number 721, April 1978).

By 1980, the name of the account had been changed to Equal Educational Opportunities. Based on budget data for that year, the account was subdivided into three programs. Funds for emergency school aid were allocated 100% for youth and classified as DS. For the two remaining programs - training and advisory services and women's educational equity - funds were allocated for youth based on the same data as 1976. Funds for training and advisory services were classified as PG and funds for women's educational equity were classified as LP.

SUMMARY TABLE

	Youth Services					
1976	DS	PF	LP	PG	Other	Total
Training & Advisory Services	-	-	-	3,923	13,135	17,058
All others	196,173	-	-	-	-	196,173
TOTAL	196,173	-	-	3,923	13,135	213,231
1980						
Emergency School Aid	247,876	-	-	-	-	247,876
Training & Advisory Services	-	-	-	9,198	32,612	41,810
Women's Educational Equity	-	-	1,971	-	6,989	8,960
TOTAL	247,876	-	1,971	9,198	39,601	298,646

Human Development Services HIST # 050600

This account existed in 1970, 1976, and 1980. For 1970 the allocation for children and youth was based on youth as a share of the total population. This sum was classified as PG.

For 1976, based on budget data, the account was subdivided into three programs. For the Headstart and child abuse programs, 100% of the account was allocated to youth. These sums were classified as DS. For the research and demonstration program, funds were allocated on the basis of youth as a share of the total population. This sum was classified as PG.

For 1980, based on budget data, the account was subdivided into five programs. For Headstart, child abuse, child welfare training and adoption opportunities, 100% of the account funds were allocated for youth and classified as DS. For the research and demonstration program, funds were allocated on the basis of youth as a share of the total population. This sum was classified as PG.

SUMMARY TABLE

	Youth Services					
	DS	PF	LP	PG	Other	Total
			1970			
TOTAL	-	-	-	3,617	6,991	10,608
			1976			
Headstart	464,664	-	-	-	-	46,664
Child Abuse	19,986	-	-	-	-	19,986
Research & Demonstration	-	-	-	4,542	10,447	14,989
TOTAL	484,650	-	-	4,542	10,447	499,639
			1980			
Headstart	705,044	-	-	-	-	705,044
Research & Demonstration	-	-	-	4,306	10,856	15,162
Child Abuse	22,744	-	-	-	-	22,744
Child Welfare Training	7,581	-	-	-	-	7,581
Adoption Opportunities	7,581	-	-	-	-	7,581
TOTAL	742,950	-	-	4,306	10,856	758,112

Indian Education HIST # 046700

This account existed only in 1976 and 1980. For 1976, 100% of the funds were allocated to children and youth and classified as DS.

For 1980, based on budget data, the account was subdivided into four programs. The special programs for Indian adults account was not classified as a service for children. For payments to LEA's and non-LEA's and special programs for Indian students, 100% of the account funds were allocated for youth and classified as DS. Funds for program administration were allocated for youth in proportion to all other account funds.

SUMMARY TABLE

	Youth Services					
	DS	PF	LP	PG	Other	Total
1976 TOTAL	42,046	-	-	-	-	42,046
1980						
Payments to LEA's & Non-LEA's	47,502	-	-	-	-	47,502
Special Programs for Indian Students	14,670	-	-	-	-	14,670
Program Administration	1,928	-	-	-	168	2,096
All Other	-	-	-	-	5,588	5,588
TOTAL	64,100	-	-	-	5,756	69,856

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Library Resources

HIST # 046800

This account existed in 1964, 1970, 1976, and 1980. For 1964, 25% of the account funds were allocated for children based on youth enrolled in school as a share of the total population. This allocation figure was developed from school enrollment data reported in The Condition of Education (U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, National Center for Social Statistics, 1978, Table 66) and population data reported in Current Population Reports (U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of Census, Series P-25, Number 519, April 1974). This sum was classified as LP.

For 1970, based on budget data, the account was subdivided into seven programs. For two programs - public libraries and educational broadcasting facilities - 25% of the funds were allocated to children based on youth enrolled in school as a share of the total population. These sums were classified as LP. The 25% figure was used again to allocate funds to youth for three other programs - librarian training, Library of Congress cataloging, and planning and evaluation. These sums were classified as PG. The basis of allocation for these five programs was the same as for 1970. The two remaining programs - college library resources and university community service program - were not classified as services for youth.

For 1976, based on budget data, the account was subdivided into four programs. For public libraries 23% was allocated to children and youth. This sum was classified as LP. For training and demonstration, 23% was used again to allocate funds for youth. This sum was classified as PG. This allocation figure was developed from education data reported in The Condition of Education (U.S. Department of Health,Education and

Welfare, National Center for Social Statistics, 1978, Table 66) and population data reported in Current Population Reports (U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, Series P-25, Number 721, April 1978). The two remaining programs - college library resources and college instructional equipment - were not classified as services for youth.

For 1980, 22% of all account funds were allocated for youth and classified as PG. This allocation figure was developed from education data reported in The Condition of Education (U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, National Center for Social Statistics, 1979, p. 52) and population data reported in Current Population Reports (U. S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, Series P-25, no. 870, January 1980).

SUMMARY TABLE

	Youth Services					
	DS	PF	LP	PG	Other	Total
			1964			
TOTAL	-	-	627	-	1,881	2,508
			1970			
Public Libraries	-	-	14,537	-	43,611	58,148
Ed. Broadcasting Facilities	-	-	1,949	-	5,848	7,797
All others	-	-	-	10,585	31,754	42,339
TOTAL	-	-	16,486	10,585	81,213	108,284
			1976			
Public Libraries	-	-	34,215	-	76,872	111,087
Training & Administration	-	-	-	983	2,208	3,191
All others	-	-	-	-	37,687	37,687
TOTAL	-	-	34,215	983	116,767	151,965
			1980			
TOTAL	-	-	28,288	-	100,292	128,580

Library and Learning Resources

This account existed only in 1980. Based on budget data the account was subdivided into four programs. For two programs - school libraries and instructional resources, and research libraries - 22% of the funds were allocated for youth based on education data reported in The Condition of Education (U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, National Center for Social Statistics, 1979, p. 52) and population data reported in Current Population Reports (U. S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, Series P-25, no. 870, January 1980). The sum for school libraries and instructional resources was classified as LP and the sum for research libraries was classified as PG.

For educational television programming 100% of the account funds were allocated for youth and classified as DS. The fourth program, college library resources, was not classified as services for youth.

SUMMARY TABLE

	Youth Services					
	DS	PF	LP	PG	Other	Total
School Libraries & Instructional Resources	-	-	29,995	-	106,344	136,339
Research Libraries	-	-	-	978	3,468	4,446
Educational TV Programming	2,964	-	-	-	-	2,964
All Other	-	-	-	-	4,446	4,446
TOTAL	2,964	-	29,995	978	114,258	148,193

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

National Foundation for the Arts and Humanities HIST = 124500 & 124800

This account existed in 1970, 1976, and 1980. For 1970, based on budget data, the account was subdivided into three programs. For the promotion of the arts, 9.5% of the funds were allocated for children and youth based on the share of total agency funds obligated for education programs as reported in the 1970 Annual Report (National Endowment for the Arts). This sum was classified as DS.

For the promotion of the humanities, 11.7% of the funds were allocated for youth based on the share of total agency funds obligated /for elementary education programs as reported in the Fifth Annual Report (National Endowment for the Humanities, 1970). This sum was classified as DS.

For administration, funds were allocated for children and youth in proportion to the aggregate amounts for youth in the other programs in this hist fund account. This sum was classified as DS.

For 1976, based on budget data, the account was subdivided into the same three programs as for 1970. For the promotion of the arts 4.9% of the funds were allocated to youth based on the share of total agency funds obligated for education programs as reported in the 1976 Annual Report (National Endowment for the Arts). This sum was classified as DS.

For the promotion of the humanities, 8.3% of the account funds were allocated for youth based on the share of total agency funds obligated for elementary and secondary programs as reported in the Eleventh Annual Report (National Endowment for the Humanities, 1976). This sum was classified as DS. The funds for administration were allocated and classified on the same basis as for 1970.

For 1980, 4.9% of the funds were allocated to youth based on agency funds from the National Endowment for the Arts obligated for education programs as reported in the 1976 Annual Report (National Endowment for the Arts). This sum was classified as DS.

SUMMARY TABLE

	Youth Services					
	DS	PF	LP	PG	Other	Total
			1970			
TOTAL	1,333	-	-	-	11,292	12,625
			1976			
TOTAL	9,502	-	-	-	138,848	144,350
			1980			
TOTAL	6,958	-	-	-	135,045	142,003

National Endowment for the Humanities Salaries & Expenses

This account existed only in 1980. For that year, 8.3% of the funds were allocated for youth based on the share of total agency funds obligated for elementary and secondary programs as reported in the Eleventh Annual Report (National Endowment for the Humanities, 1976). This sum was classified as DS.

SUMMARY TABLE

	Youth Services					
	DS	PF	LP	PG	Other	Total
TOTAL	12,506	-	-	-	138,169	150,665

National Institute of Education HIST # 048400

This account existed only in 1976 and 1980. The allocation of funds for children and youth was based on the share of youth in the general population. These sums were classified as PG.

SUMMARY TABLE

	Youth Services					
	DS	PF	LP	PG	Other	Total
1976						
TOTAL	-	-	-	21,143	48,635	69,778
1980						
TOTAL	-	-	-	12,494	31,499	43,993

Occupational, Vocational and Adult Education HIST # 047200

This account existed in 1964, 1970, 1976, and 1980. For 1964, 100% of the account funds were allocated for children and youth. This sum was classified as DS.

For 1970, based on budget data, the account was subdivided into four programs. For the grants to states for vocational education program, 100% of the funds were allocated for youth and classified as DS.

For two programs—vocational research and planning and evaluation--funds were allocated for youth on the basis of youth as a share of the total population. These sums were classified as PG. The adult education program was not classified as a service for children.

For 1976, based on budget data, the account was subdivided into three programs. For two programs—vocational education and education personnel—100% of the funds were allocated to youth and classified as DS. The adult education program did not provide services on behalf of children.

For 1980, based on budget data, the account was subdivided into six programs. For five programs - vocational education, career education incentives, community schools, consumers' education and the consolidated working fund - 100% of the funds were allocated for youth and classified as DS. The sixth program, adult education, did not provide services for youth.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Occupational, Vocational and Adult Education HIST # 047200

SUMMARY TABLE

	Youth Services					
	DS	PF	LP	PG	Other	Total
			1964			
TOTAL	41,076	-	-	-	-	41,076
			1970			
Grants to States for Vocational Education	286,909	-	-	-	-	286,909
Vocational Research	-	-	-	2,743	5,301	8,044
Adult Education	-	-	-	-	39,551	39,551
Planning & Evaluation	-	-	-	228	442	670
TOTAL	286,909	-	-	2,971	45,294	335,174
			1976			
Vocational Education	624,165	-	-	-	-	624,165
Adult Education	-	-	-	-	76,245	76,245
Ed. Personnel	47,093	-	-	-	-	47,093
TOTAL	671,258	-	-	-	76,245	747,503
			1980			
Vocational Education	754,620	-	-	-	-	754,620
Career Ed. Incentives	1,187	-	-	-	-	1,187
Community Schools	2,798	-	-	-	-	2,798
Consumers' Ed.	2,459	-	-	-	-	2,459
Consolidated Working Fund	2,035	-	-	-	-	2,035
Adult Education	-	-	-	-	84,789	84,789
TOTAL	763,099	-	-	-	84,789	847,888

Operation of Indian Programs HIST # 060000

This account existed in 1964, 1970, 1976 and 1980.

For 1964, based on budget data, the account was subdivided into five programs. For two programs--educational assistance facilities and services and the school district costs associated with the Menoninee educational grants--100% of the funds were allocated for youth. These sums were classified as DS.

For welfare and guidance services, 75% of the account funds were allocated for youth based on the share of Aid to Dependent Children (AFDC) recipients who were children. This sum was classified as LP. Data for determining this allocation were provided by the Social Security Administration, Office of Research and Statistics. Funds for children from the maintaining of law and order program were allocated on the same basis. This sum was classified as PG. The relocation and adult vocational training program was not classified as a service for children.

For 1970, based on budget data, the account was subdivided into four programs. For two--education assistance &facilities and services--100% of the funds were allocated for youth and classified as DS. For welfare and guidance facilities, 73% of the funds were allocated for youth based on the share of AFDC recipients who were children. This sum was classified as LP. Data for determining this allocation were provided by the Social Security Administration, Office of Research and Statistics. Funds for children from the maintaining law and order program were allocated on the same basis. This sum was classified as PG. The employment assistance program did not provide services for children.

For 1976, 100% of the account funds were allocated for children and youth and classified as DS.

For 1980, based on budget data, the education account was subdivided into three programs. For school operations and Johnson - O'Malley assistance, 100% of the funds were allocated for youth and classified as DS. The third program, continuing education, was not classified as services for youth.

SUMMARY TABLE

	Youth Services					
	DS	PF	LP	PG	Other	Total
			1964			
Educational Assistance, Facilities & Services	66,955	-	-	-	-	66,955
Welfare & Guidance Services	-	-	8,090	-	2,697	10,787
Relocation & Adult Vocational Educational Training	-	-	-	-	9,094	9,094
Maintaining Law & Order	-	-	-	1,504	725	2,229
Menominee Educational Grants	89	-	-	-	-	89
TOTAL	67,044	-	8,090	1,504	12,516	89,154
			1970			
Educational Assistance, Facilities & Services	115,882	-	-	-	-	115,882
Welfare & Guidance Services	-	-	21,887	-	8,095	29,982
Employment Assistance	-	-	-	-	33,293	33,293
Maintaining Law & Order	-	-	-	3,491	1,291	4,782
TOTAL	115,882	-	21,887	3,491	42,579	183,939
			1976			
TOTAL	277,690	-	-	-	-	277,690

(Summary Table, cont.)

	Youth Services					
	DS	PF	LP	PG	Other	Total
			1980			
School Operations	159,982	-	-	-	-	159,982
Johnson - O'Malley Ed. Assist.	25,504	-	-	-	-	25,504
All Other	-	-	-	-	46,372	46,372
TOTAL	185,486	-	-	-	46,372	231,858

Public Broadcasting Fund HIST # 114000

This account existed in 1964, 1970, 1976, and 1980.

For 1964 and 1970, 36.3% of the funds were allocated for youth based on the share of the households with children under 17 years of age reached by the Public Broadcasting Service during the period October 15 to November 15, 1973 as reported by A.C. Nielson, The National T.V. Index, special analysis. These sums were classified as LP.

For 1976, 64.2% of the funds were allocated for youth based on similar data covering the period April 30-May 5, 1979. This sum was also classified as LP.

For 1980, funds for youth were allocated and classified in the same manner as for 1976.

SUMMARY TABLE

	Youth Services					
	DS	PF	LP	PG	Other	Total
			1964			
TOTAL	-	-	712	-	1,250	1,962
			1970			
TOTAL	-	-	5,445	-	9,555	15,000
			1976			
TOTAL	-	-	44,940	-	25,060	70,000
			1980			
TOTAL	-	-	97,584	-	54,416	152,000

Rehabilitation Services & Handicapped Education

This account existed only in 1980. For that year, 11.1% of account funds were allocated for youth based on data supplied by the Division of Program Data and Analysis, Rehabilitation Services Administration. This sum was classified as PG.

SUMMARY TABLE

	Youth Services					
	DS	PF	LP	PG	Other	Total
TOTAL	-	-	-	49,928	399,873	449,802

Research and Related Activities - NIE

This account existed only in 1980. For that year funds were allocated for youth on the basis of their share of the general population. This sum was classified PG.

SUMMARY TABLE

	Youth Services					
	DS	PF	LP	PG	Other	Total
TOTAL	-	-	-	10,515	26,511	37,026

Salaries and Expenses, National Gallery of Art HIST # 132100

This account existed only in 1976 and 1980. The allocation of funds for youth was based on youth as a share of the general population in each year. These sums were classified as LP.

SUMMARY TABLE

	Youth Services					
	DS	PF	LP	PG	Other	Total
1976 TOTAL	-	-	2,335	-	5,370	7,705
1980 TOTAL	-	-	6,404	-	16,145	22,549

School Assistance in Federally Affected Areas HIST = 047500

This account existed in 1964, 1970, 1976, and 1980. In all four years, 100% of the account funds were allocated for youth and classified as DS.

SUMMARY TABLE

	Youth Services					
	DS	PF	LP	PG	Other	Total
1964	334,289	-	-	-	-	334,289
1970	656,372	-	-	-	-	656,372
1976	598,884	-	-	-	-	598,884
1980	821,103	-	-	-	-	821,103

School Improvement Programs

This account existed only in 1980. For that year 100% of the funds were allocated for youth and classified as DS.

SUMMARY TABLE

	Youth Services					
	DS	PF	LP	PG	Other	Total
TOTAL	89,142	-	-	-	-	89,142

Science and Education Administration Extension Activities HIST # 016200

This account existed in 1964, 1970, 1976, and 1980. For 1964, based on budget data, this account was subdivided into four programs. For three programs--payments to states, penalty mail and the federal extension service--33% of the account funds were allocated for youth based on the share of state payments made by the Federal Extension Service, U. S. Department of Agriculture for 4-H programs. These sums were classified as LP. The fourth program, retirement and employee compensation costs, was not classified as a service for children.

For 1970, the account funds were allocated and classified based on the same data and in the same manner as in 1964.

For 1976, 26% of the account funds were allocated for children based on the share of state payments made by the Federal Extension Service for 4-H programs. This sum was classified as LP.

For 1980, the youth share was allocated and classified in the same manner as 1976.

SUMMARY TABLE

	Youth Services					
	DS	PF	LP	PG	Other	Total
			1964			
Retirement & Employees Compensation Costs	-	-	-	-	6,987	6,987
All others	-	-	23,721	-	48,694	72,415
TOTAL			23,721	-	55,681	79,402
			1970			
TOTAL	-	-	41,093	-	83,433	124,526
			1976			
TOTAL	-	-	57,046	-	162,361	219,407
			1980			
TOTAL	-	-	67,660	-	192,572	260,232

Smithsonian Institution, Salaries & Expenses HIST # 131500

This account existed in 1964, 1970, 1976, and 1980. In all four years, the account funds were allocated for youth based on the share of youth in the general population. These sums were classified as LP.

SUMMARY TABLE

	Youth Services					
	DS	PL	LP	PG	Other	Total
1964	-	-	7,954	-	13,837	21,791
1970	-	-	13,073	-	25,265	38,338
1976	-	-	24,819	-	57,091	81,910
1980	-	-	30,539	-	76,994	107,533

Special Projects and Training HIST # 04700

This account existed only in 1964, 1976, and 1980. For 1964 and 1976, 100% of the account funds were allocated for youth and classified as DS.

For 1980, based on budget data, the account was subdivided into five programs. For two programs - special projects and career education - 100% of the funds were allocated for youth and classified as DS. For two programs - women's education equity and education personnel and training - funds were allocated for youth based on their share of the general population. These sums were classified as LP. For the planning and evaluation program, funds were allocated and classified in proportion to all other account funds.

SUMMARY TABLE

	Youth Services					
	DS	PF	LP	PG	Other	Total
1964	34,542	-	-	-	-	34,542
1976	283	-	-	-	-	283
1980						
Special Projects	18,574	-	-	-	-	18,574
Career Education	23,336	-	-	-	-	23,336
Women's Ed. Equity	-	-	541	-	1,364	1,905
Ed. Personnel & Training	-	-	541	-	1,364	1,905
Planning & Evaluation	1,739	-	44	-	122	1,905
TOTAL	43,649	-	1,126	-	2,850	47,625

Community Services Program HIST # 113300

This account existed only in 1970 and 1976.

For 1970, 63% of the account funds were allocated for youth based on the share of program participants under 18 reported in "Summary of 1975 CAA Sample Survey" (Community Services Administration 1976). This sum was classified as LP.

For 1976, 56% of the account funds were allocated for youth based on the same data source as for 1970. This sum was classified as LP.

SUMMARY TABLE

	Youth Services					
	DS	PF	LP	PG	Other	Total
			1970			
TOTAL	-	-	441,362	-	256,006	697,368
			1976			
TOTAL	-	-	1,128	-	888	2,016

Employment and Training Assistance HIST # 066800

This account existed in 1964, 1970, 1976, and 1980. In 1964, the account was not classified as a service for youth.

For 1970, based on budget data, the account was subdivided into eight programs. For the summer youth program, 100% of the funds were allocated for youth and classified as DS. Based on data presented in the Manpower Report of the President, 1971 it was estimated that 30% of the special targeting program could be allocated for youth. This sum was classified as LP. Program support was allocated in proportion to the other accounts for youth and classified as PG. The five programs remaining in the account were not classified as services for youth.

For 1976, the account was subdivided into three programs. All of the funds in the summer youth program were allocated for youth and classified as DS. Using data supplied by the Employment and Training Administration, Office of Administration and Management, it was estimated that 17.5% of the state and local programs and the national programs could be allocated for youth. These sums were classified as LP.

For 1980, 32.1% of the entire account was allocated for youth and classified as LP based on data supplied by the Employment and Training Administration, Office of Administration and Management.

Employment and Training Assistance HIST # 066800

SUMMARY TABLE

	Youth Services					
	DS	PF	LP	PG	Other	Total
			1964			
TOTAL	-	-	-	-	-	122,117
			1970			
Summer Work Support	13,470	-	-	-	-	13,470
Special Targeting	-	-	11,244	-	25,798	37,042
Program Support	-	-	-	1,557	24,961	26,518
All other	-	-	-	-	343,897	343,897
TOTAL	13,470	-	11,244	1,557	394,656	420,927
			1976			
Summer Youth	536,779	-	-	-	-	536,779
All other	-	-	458,630	-	2,162,115	2,620,745
TOTAL	536,779	-	458,630	-	2,162,115	2,620,745
			1980			
TOTAL	-	-	2,193,417	-	4,639,657	6,833,074

Job Opportunities Program HIST # 029500

This account existed in 1976 and 1980. In both years, of the total program funds, 1% was allocated for youth based on estimates of youth under 18 participating in the program reported in "An Evaluation of the Direct Impacts of the Job Opportunities Program, Title X" (Program Evaluation Division, Economic Development Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, unpublished, 1979). This sum was classified as LP.

SUMMARY TABLE

	Youth Services					
	DS	PF	LP	PG	Other	Total
1976 TOTAL	-	-	2,694	-	266,742	269,436
1980 TOTAL	-	-	120	-	11,909	12,029

Temporary Employment Assistance

HIST # 066800

This account existed only in 1976 and 1980. For 1976, based on data supplied by Employment and Training Administration, Office of Administration and Management, 22% of the enrollees in the Title VI program of the Comprehensive Employment and Training Act were under 22 years. Accordingly, it was estimated that 7% of the funds could be allocated for youth under 18. This sum was classified as LP.

For 1980, 32.1% of the account was allocated for youth and classified as LP based on data supplied by the Employment and Training Administration, Office of Administration.

SUMMARY TABLE

	Youth Services					
	DS	PF	LP	PG	Other	Total
1976	-	-	132,113	-	1,755,214	1,887,327
1980	-	-	559,824	-	1,184,176	1,744,000

Unemployment Trust Fund (Training & Employment) HIST = 067500

This account existed in 1964, 1970, 1976, and 1980.

For 1964 and 1970 funds were allocated for youth based on data relating to "characteristics of individuals placed by the U.S. Employment Services, by State, fiscal 1976" presented in the U.S. Department of Labor, Employment and Training Report of the President, 1977, Table F-9. These figures showed that 41% of all recipients were under 22 years in 1976. Accordingly, it was estimated that 8% of the funds could be allocated for youth under 18. These sums were classified as LP.

For 1976, according to the U.S. Employment Service, 13.5% of employment service recipients were under 18 years. This sum was classified as LP.

For 1980, funds were allocated for youth based on data relating to "Characteristics of Individuals Placed by the USES by State, FY 1978", presented in the U. S. Department of Labor Employment and Training Report of the President 1979, Table F-9. These figures showed that 44% of all individuals placed by the U. S. Employment Service were under 22 years in 1978. Accordingly it was estimated that 14.5% of the funds were for youth under 18. This sum was classified as LP.

SUMMARY TABLE

	Youth Services					
	DS	PF	LP	PG	Other	Total
			1964			
TOTAL	-	-	14,163	-	162,879	177,042
			1970			
TOTAL	-	-	29,238	-	336,237	365,475
			1976			
TOTAL	-	-	50,053	-	315,299	365,352
			1980			
TOTAL	-	-	108,829	-	641,719	750,548

Work Incentives HIST # 050900

This program existed in 1970, 1976, and 1980.

For 1970, based on budget data, the account was subdivided into two programs. All of the funds for the child care program were allocated for youth and classified as DS. The second program, training incentives, was not classified as a service for youth.

For 1976, the account was not classified as a service for youth.

For 1980, account funds were allocated for youth based on data relating to "Selected Characteristics of WIN Registrants and Job Entrants" presented in U. S. Department of Labor, Employment and Training Report of the President, 1979, Table 6. These figures show that 8.9% of WIN registrants were under the age of 20 in 1978. Accordingly, it was estimated that 4.4% of the funds could be allocated for youth under 18. This sum was classified as LP.

SUMMARY TABLE

	Youth Services					
	DS	PF	LP	PG	Other	Total
			1970			
Child Care	15,591	-	-	-	-	15,591
Training Incentives	-	-	-	-	70,027	70,027
TOTAL	15,591	-	-	-	70,027	85,618
			1976			
TOTAL	-	-	-	-	307,313	307,313
			1980			
TOTAL	-	-	16,060	-	348,940	365,000

Youth Conservation Corps HIST # 024900

This account existed in 1976 and 1980.

For 1976, 100% of the account funds were allocated for youth and classified as DS.

For 1980, 75% of the funds were allocated to youth based on 15-17 year olds as a share of the total eligible beneficiaries as defined in the Appendix to the U. S. Budget FY 1981. This sum was classified as DS.

SUMMARY TABLE

	Youth Services					
	DS	PF	LP	PG	Other	Total
1976 TOTAL	17,389	-	-	-	-	17,389
1980 TOTAL	41,524	-	-	-	13,841	55,365

Alcohol, Drug Abuse & Mental Health Administration (ADAMHA) HIST # 044100

This account existed in 1964, 1970, 1976, and 1980.

For 1964 and 1970 funds for the various programs within this account were allocated for youth based on data supplied by Office of the Administrator, ADAMHA, DHEW indicating that 23% of service program funds and 15% of research program funds were targeted for youth. All activities in 1964 were classified as PG. In 1970 service programs were classified as LP, research and manpower development programs were classified as PG, and life supporting activities program was divided among categories in proportion to all other account funds.

For 1976 this account included three separate sets of programmatic activities as well as funds for buildings and program direction. Based on data supplied by the Office of the Administrator ADAMHA, 18% of the funds for buildings and program direction were allocated for youth and classified as LP. For mental health activities, 24% of the research and training funds were allocated for youth based on data supplied by the Office of the Administrator. These sums were classified as PG. The childrens services subprogram funds were totally allocated to youth, and all other mental health funds were allocated for youth based on their share of the population. For drug abuse activities, 11% of research and training funds were allocated for youth based on data supplied by the Office of the Administrator, and other program activities were allocated for youth based on their share of the population. For alcohol abuse activities 1.2% of research funds and 2.4% of training and all other program funds were allocated for youth based on data provided by the Office of the Administrator. Research and training funds were classified as PG; all other program funds were classified as LP.

For 1980, the account was allocated and classified in the same manner as 1976, except that there was no longer a separate program for general Mental Health childrens services and buildings.

Alcohol, Drug Abuse & Mental Health Administration (ADAMHA)

HIST # 044100

SUMMARY TABLE

	Youth Services					
	DS	PF	LP	PG	Other	Total
			1964			
TOTAL	-	-	-	32,108	128,172	160,280
			1970			
Research	-	-	-	16,737	94,840	111,577
Manpower Development	-	-	-	28,497	95,401	123,898
Program Support Activities	-	-	739	1,725	9,857	12,321
All other	-	-	21,726	-	72,737	94,463
TOTAL	-	-	22,465	46,959	272,835	342,259
			1976			
General Mental Health						
Research	-	-	-	26,778	81,373	108,151
Training	-	-	-	20,681	77,798	98,479
Childrens Services	29,896	-	-	-	-	29,896
All other	-	-	57,014	-	131,152	188,166
Drug Abuse						
Research	-	-	-	4,256	34,432	38,688
Training	-	-	-	1,143	10,288	11,431
All other	-	-	66,072	-	151,989	218,061
Alcohol Abuse						
Research	-	-	-	169	13,899	14,068
Training	-	-	-	211	8,582	8,793
All other	-	-	3,566	-	145,033	148,599
Buildings	-	-	317	-	1,442	1,759
Program Direction	-	-	2,374	-	10,815	13,189
TOTAL	29,896	-	129,343	53,238	666,803	879,280

(ADAMHA Summary Table, p. 2)

	Youth Services					
	DS	PF	LP	PG	Other	Total
			1980			
General Mental Health						
Research	-	-	-	38,733	122,656	161,389
Training	-	-	-	22,784	72,151	94,935
Services	-	-	77,666	-	178,657	256,323
All Other	-	-	10,785	-	27,189	37,974
Drug Abuse						
Research	-	-	-	5,221	42,246	47,467
Training	-	-	-	1,044	8,449	9,493
All Other	-	-	53,923	-	135,946	189,869
Alcohol Abuse						
Research	-	-	-	342	28,138	28,480
Training	-	-	-	233	9,260	9,493
All Other	-	-	2,506	-	101,922	104,428
Program Direction	-	-	1,709	-	7,785	9,494
TOTAL	-	-	146,589	68,357	734,399	949,345

Center for Disease Control--Preventive Health Services

HIST # 040300
040400

This account existed in 1964, 1970, 1976, and 1980.

In 1964, the account was subdivided into four programs. For the VD control program and the foreign quarentine program, funds were allocated for youth based on their share of the population and classified PG. The TB control program was divided into two subprograms: the grants subprogram was allocated exclusively to adults; the research and training subprogram was allocated to youth in proportion to their share of the population and classified as PG. The fourth program was grants for research. Under this program all funds for immunization were allocated for youth and classified as DS; the remaining funds were allocated to youth in proportion to their share of the population and classified as PG.

For 1970, the entire account was allocated for children in proportion to their share of the population and classified as PG.

For 1976 the account was subdivided into four programs. One, the occupational health program, was not classified as a service for youth. The buildings and facilities program was allocated for youth in proportion to their share of the population and classified as PG. The disease control program was allocated for youth based on their share of the population; project grants in this program were classified as LP while other activities were classified as PG. The final program, project management was allocated in proportion to the other accounts for youth and classified as LP.

For 1980, the account was allocated and classified in the same manner as 1976.

Center for Disease Control

HIST # 040300
040400

SUMMARY TABLE

	Youth Services					
	DS	PF	LP	PG	Other	Total
			1964			
VD and Foreign Quarantine	-	-	-	4,889	8,505	13,394
TB Control Grants	-	-	-	-	3,691	3,691
Research & Training	-	-	-	675	1,233	1,908
Grants for Research Community Immunization	8,045	-	-	-	-	8,045
All Other	-	-	-	5,109	9,322	14,431
TOTAL	8,045	-	-	10,673	22,751	41,469
			1970			
TOTAL	-	-	-	16,690	32,254	48,944
			1976			
Building & Facilities	-	-	-	53	121	174
Disease Control Project Grants	-	-	14,152	-	32,555	46,707
All other	-	-	-	21,728	49,982	71,710
Project Management	-	-	1,409	2,169	8,229	11,807
Occupational Health	-	-	-	-	43,235	43,235
TOTAL	-	-	15,561	23,950	134,122	173,633

(Table, cont. . .)

(Summary Table, p. 2)

	Youth Services					
	DS	PF	LP	PG	Other	Total
			1980			
Buildings & Facilities	-	-	-	3,485	8,786	12,271
Disease Control						
Project Grants	-	-	19,516	-	49,203	68,719
All Other	-	-	-	29,274	73,804	103,078
Project Management	-	-	260	423	1,771	2,454
OSHA	-	-	-	-	58,902	58,902
TOTAL	-	-	19,776	33,182	192,466	245,424

Federal Hospital Insurance Trust Fund (HI) HIST # 046500

This account existed only in 1970, 1976, and 1980.

For 1970 the account was not classified as a service for children.

For 1976, data supplied by the Health Care Financing Administration, Office of Planning and Research indicated that .05% of the funds provided coverage for the medical costs of children receiving chronic renal dialysis care under the HI program. This sum was classified as LP.

For 1980, data supplied by the Health Care Financing Administration, Office of Policy Planning and Research indicated that .01% of the funds provided coverage for the Medicaid costs of children receiving chronic renal dialysis care under the HI program. This sum was classified as LP.

SUMMARY TABLE

	Youth Services					
	DS	PF	LP	PG	Other	Total
1970	-	-	-	-	4,952,911	4,952,911
1976	-	-	6,056	-	12,572,571	12,578,627
1980	-	-	3,065	-	23,218,143	23,221,208

Federal Supplementary Medical Insurance Trust Fund (SMI)   HIST # 046400

This account existed in 1970, 1976, and 1980.

For 1970, the account was not classified as a service for children.

For 1976, data supplied by the Health Care Financing Administration, Office of Planning and Research indicated that .3% of the funds provided coverage for the medical costs of children receiving chronic renal dialysis care under the SMI program. This sum was classified as LP.

For 1980, data supplied by the Health Care Financing Administration, Office of Planning and Research indicated that .1% of the funds provided coverage for the medical costs of children receiving chronic renal dialysis care under the SMI program. This sum was classified as LP.

SUMMARY TABLE

	Youth Services					
	DS	PF	LP	PG	Other	Total
1970	-	-	-	-	2,196,296	2,196,296
1976	-	-	17,909	-	5,182,184	5,200,093
1980	-	-	9,768	-	10,315,769	10,325,537

Grants to States for Medicaid Payments

HIST # 046200

This account existed in 1964, 1970, 1976, and 1980.

For 1964, the account was not classified as a service for children because medical assistance payments were limited to the aged.

For 1970, 19% of account funds were allocated for youth based on the share of medical expenditures under public programs as reported in Barbara Cooper and Mary McGee, "Medical Care Outlays for Three Age Groups: Young, Intermediate and Aged," Social Security Bulletin, May 1971, Volume 34, Number 5, Table 4. This sum was classified as LP.

For 1976, 17.2% of the funds were allocated for youth based on the share of medical expenditures under public programs as reported by Robert Gibson, Majorie Smith Mueller and Charles R. Fisher, "Age Differences in Health Care Spending, Fiscal Year 1976," Social Security Bulletin, August 1977, Volume 40, Number 8, Table 3. This sum was classified as LP.

For 1980, 17.5% of the account funds were allocated for youth based on the share of medical expenditures under public programs in 1977 as reported by Robert Gibson and Charles Fisher, "Age Differences in Health Care Spending Fiscal Year 1977," Social Security Bulletin, January 1979, Volume 42, Number 1, Table 4.

SUMMARY TABLE

	Youth Services					
	DS	PF	LP	PG	Other	Total
			1970			
TOTAL	-	-	518,100	-	2,208,745	2,726,824
			1976			
TOTAL	-	-	1,473,737	-	7,094,500	8,568,237
			1980			
TOTAL	-	-	2,471,173	-	11,649,818	14,120,991

Health Services

HIST # 040000

This account existed in 1964, 1970, 1976, and 1980.

For 1964 based on budget data the account was subdivided into four programs. For two programs—maternal and child welfare and the childrens bureau—100% of the funds were allocated for youth and classified as DS. For the two other programs, funds were allocated to youth on the basis of their share of the population and classified as LP.

For 1970, the account was subdivided into three programs. All funds for the maternal and child health programs were allocated for youth and classified as DS. For the two remaining programs, funds were allocated for youth on the basis of their share of the general population and classified as LP.

For 1976 the account was subdivided into seven programs. One program, patient care and special health services, was not classified as a service for youth. The quality assurance program and the buildings and facilities program were allocated for youth on the basis of their share of the general population and classified as LP. The funds for the HMO program and the emergency medical services program were allocated for youth based on their share of the population and classified as LP. The community health services program was divided into six subprograms. The maternal and child health subprogram and the family planning subprogram were allocated 100% for youth and classified as DS.

The four remaining subprograms were allocated for youth in proportion to their share of the population and classified as LP. The seventh program—program management—was allocated for youth on the basis of their share of the general population and classified as LP.

For 1980, the account was subdivided into three programs. The community services program was divided into nine subprograms. The maternal and child health subprogram and the family planning subprogram were allocated 100% for youth and classified as DS. The seven remaining subprograms were allocated for youth in proportion to their share of the population and classified as LP.

The funds for health care services and program management programs were allocated for youth in proportion to their share of the population and classified as LP.

SUMMARY TABLE

	Youth Services					
	DS	PF	LP	PG	Other	Total
			1964			
Maternal and Child Welfare	92,376	-	-	-	-	92,376
Salaries and Expenses Childrens Bureau	3,553	-	-	-	-	3,553
All other	-	-	29,827	-	51,890	81,717
TOTAL	95,929	-	29,827	-	51,890	177,646
			1970			
Maternal and Child Health	267,187	-	-	-	-	267,187
All other	-	-	94,829	-	183,263	278,092
TOTAL	267,187	-	94,829	-	183,263	545,279
			1976			
Quality Assurance	-	-	12,214	-	28,097	40,311
Buildings & Facilities	-	-	1,018	-	2,341	3,359
HMO's	-	-	6,786	-	15,610	22,396
Emergency Medical Services	-	-	10,178	-	23,414	33,592
Patient Care and Special Health Services	-	-	-	-	167,960	167,960

SUMMARY TABLE

	Youth Services					
	DS	PF	LP	PG	Other	Total
Community Health						
Maternal & Child Health	370,636	-	-	-	-	370,636
Family Planning	100,777	-	-	-	-	100,777
All other	-	-	101,785	-	234,138	335,923
Program Management	-	-	13,571	-	31,219	44,790
TOTAL	471,413	-	145,552	-	502,779	1,119,744

1980

	DS	PF	LP	PG	Other	Total
Community Services						
Maternal & Child Health	325,010	-	-	-	-	325,010
Family Planning	132,411	-	-	-	-	132,411
All Other	-	-	153,838	-	387,844	541,682
Health Care Services	-	-	54,698	-	137,900	192,598
Program Management	-	-	3,419	-	8,619	12,038
TOTAL	457,421	-	211,955	-	534,363	1,203,739

Indian Health Facilities HIST # 040200

This account existed in 1964, 1970, 1976, and 1980.

For 1964, 1970, and 1976, 30% of the account funds were allocated for youth. This estimate was based on data relating to the "Number of Discharges by Age for IHS and Contract General Hospitals, FY 1978," supplied by Office of Program Statistics, Division of Resources Coordination, Indian Health Services, DHEW. These figures indicated that 33% of all discharges were under age 20. Accordingly, 30% of all discharges and related expenditures were estimated to be for youth under 18. These sums were classified as LP.

For 1980, 50% of the account funds were allocated for youth. This was based on the share of Indians under 18 on or near reservations eligible for service in 1980, supplied by an internal estimate from the Office of Program Statistics, Indian Health Service. This sum was classified as LP.

SUMMARY TABLE

	Youth Services					
	DS	PF	LP	PG	Other	Total
			1964			
TOTAL	-	-	1,646	-	3,840	5,486
			1970			
TOTAL	-	-	4,698	-	10,962	15,660
			1976			
TOTAL	-	-	17,791	-	41,512	59,303
			1980			
TOTAL	-	-	37,246	-	37,245	74,491

Indian Health Services

HIST # 040100

This account existed in 1964, 1970, 1976, and 1980.

Data supplied by Health Services Administration, Office of Financial Management, Indian Health Services indicated that 53% of the program funds benefitted youth in 1976. This percentage was applied in 1964, 1970, and 1976, and the sums were classified as LP.

For 1980, 50% of the account funds were allocated for youth. This was based on the share of Indians under 18 on or near reservations eligible for service in 1980, supplied by an internal estimate from the Office of Program Statistics, Indian Health Service. This sum was classified as LP.

SUMMARY TABLE

	Youth Services					
	DS	PF	LP	PG	Other	Total
1964	-	-	31,933	-	28,306	60,239
1970	-	-	55,108	-	48,870	103,978
1976	-	-	144,790	-	128,400	273,190
1980	-	-	263,085	-	263,086	526,171

Medical Care - Veterans Administration HIST # 107400

This account existed in 1964, 1970, 1976, and 1980.

For 1964 and 1970, this account was not classified as a service for children.

For 1976, based on budget data, the account was subdivided into two programs. For the CHAMPVA program 17% of the account funds were allocated for youth based on youth patient data reported in The Health Affairs Report: All Branches of Service and All Offices of Civilian Health and Medical Programs of the Uniformed Services (CHAMPUS) Beneficiaries 1976 (U.S. Department of Defense, Statistical Branch, Program Evaluation Division). This sum was classified as LP.

The second program, Veteran Medical Care, was not classified as a service for youth.

For 1980, the account was allocated and classified in the same manner as 1976.

SUMMARY TABLE

	Youth Services					
	DS	PF	LP	PG	Other	Total
			1964			
TOTAL	-	-	-	-	1,111,451	1,111,451
			1970			
TOTAL	-	-	-	-	1,652,627	1,652,627
			1976			
CHAMPVA	-	-	3,769	-	18,401	22,170
All others	-	-	-	-	3.672.789	3,672.789
	-	-	3,769	-	3,691,190	3,694,959
			1980			
CHAMPVA	-	-	10,074	-	49,187	59,261
All others	-	-	-	-	5,866,824	5,866,824
TOTAL	-	-	10,074	-	5,916,011	5,926,085

These accounts existed in 1964, 1970, 1976, and 1980. In all four years, funds were allocated for youth based on the share of children and youth in the general population These sums were classified as PG.

SUMMARY TABLE

	Youth Services					
	DS	PF	LP	PG	Other	Total
1964	-	-	-	7,030	12, 230	19,260
1970	-	-	-	23,739	45,877	69,616
1976	-	-	-	46,601	107,199	153,800
1980	-	-	-	52,696	132,854	185,550

St. Elizabeth's Hospital HIST # 043900

This account existed in 1964, 1970, 1976, and 1980.

For each year the share of total account funds allocated for youth was 5% based on an estimate by the Office of the Special Assistant to the Superintendent, St. Elizabeth's Hospital. These sums were classified LP.

SUMMARY TABLE

	Youth Services					
	DS	PF	LP	PG	Other	Total
			1964			
TOTAL	-	-	467	-	8,881	9,348
			1970			
TOTAL	-	-	836	-	15,884	16,720
			1976			
TOTAL	-	-	3,007	-	57,138	60,145
			1980			
TOTAL	-	-	4,052	-	76,990	81,042

Payments for Operation of Low Income Housing

HIST # 099500

This account existed in 1964, 1976, and 1980. In 1964 and 1976, 42% of the account funds were allocated for youth based on the share of eligible recipients for subsidized housing payments who were females with children. This percentage was based on data reported in Lower Income Housing Assistance Programs, November 1978 (U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, Office of Policy Development and Research). These sums were classified as PF.

For 1980, 47.2% of the account funds were allocated for youth based on the share of children under 18 in families reexamined for continued occupancy in low-rent public housing in 1978. This percentage was based on data reported in "Families Reexamined for Continued Occupancy in Low-Rent Public Housing," Table 225.1 (Subsidized Housing Admissions and Continued Occupancy System, DHUD). This sum was classified as PF.

SUMMARY TABLE

	Youth Services					
	DS	PF	LP	PG	Other	Total
1964	-	337	-	-	466	803
1976	-	74,710	-	-	103,171	177,881
1980	-	365,364	-	-	407,236	772,600

HIST # 099400

Subsidized Housing Programs

This account existed in 1964, 1970, 1976, and 1980. For 1964, 1970, and 1976, 42% of the account funds were allocated for youth based on the share of eligible recipients for subsidized housing payments who were females with children. This percentage was based on data reported in Lower Income Housing Assistance Programs, November 1978 (U. S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, Office of Policy Development and Research). These sums were classified as PF.

For 1980, 47% of the account funds were allocated for youth based on the mean share of recipients that were children under 18 in subsidized housing programs in 1978. This percentage was based on data from "Families Recertified for Continued Occupancy for Rent Supplement 9/30/78." Table 426.1 (Subsidized Housing Admissions and Continued Occupancy System, DHUD). This sum was classified as PF.

SUMMARY TABLE

	Youth Services				Other	Total
	DS	PF	LP	PG		
1964	-	68,944	-	-	124,177	193,121
1970	-	199,131	-	-	274,992	474,123
1976	-	958,632	-	-	1,323,824	2,282,456
1980	-	2,054,840	-	-	2,317,160	4,372,000

Assistance Payments

HIST # 049400

This account existed in 1964, 1970, 1976, and 1980.

For 1964, based on budget data, the account was subdivided into three programs: state expenditures, cost of administration, services and training and demonstration projects. For state expenditure payments on behalf of aid to families with dependent children (AFDC) recipients, 75% of the funds were allocated for youth This allocation was based on the share of AFDC recipients who were children from data supplied by the Social Security Administration, Office of Research and Statistics. This sum was classified as PF.

For state expenditure payments on behalf of aid to the blind (AB) recipients, 2% of the funds were allocated for youth based on AB recipients who were children. This allocation was made using data reported in *Findings of the 1970 AB Study, Part I, Demographic and Program Characteristics* [U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Social and Rehabilitation Service, DHEW Publication No (SRS) 73-03903, NCSS Report AB-1 (70)]. This sum was classified as LP.

State expenditure payments for recipients of old-age assistance (OAA), medical assistance for the aged (MA-aged) and aid to the permanently and totally disabled (APTD) were not classified as services for children.

The program administration costs associated with AFDC and AB were allocated and classified based on the same data and in the same manner as the state expenditures for these programs. Administration costs for the OAA, MA-aged and APTD programs were not classified as services for children. Allocation of funds for demonstration projects was based on the same data and classified in the same manner as for AFDC expenditures.

For 1970, 73% of the funds for the AFDC, emergency assistance and state and local administration costs under the maintenance assistance program were allocated for youth. This allocation was based on the share of AFDC recipients who were children from data supplied by the Social Security Administration, Office of Research and Statistics. These sums were classified as PF.

The allocation of AB funds for youth was based on the same data and classified in the same manner as for 1964. The OAA and APTD programs were not classified as services for children.

For 1976, based on budget data, the account was subdivided into two programs: maintenance assistance and child support and enforcement. For both programs, 71% of the funds were allocated for youth based on the share of AFDC recipients who were children as reported in Public Assistance Statistics, December 1976 [U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Social and Rehabilitative Services, DHEW Publication No. (SRS) 77-03100, NCSS Report A-2 (12/76)]. These sums were classified as PF.

For 1980, the account was subdivided into three programs: maintenance assistance, research and evaluation and administrative expenses. For all programs, 70% of the funds were allocated for youth based on the share of AFDC recipients for FY 1979 who were children. Data were supplied by the U. S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Division of Family Assistance Services. These sums were classified as PF.

SUMMARY TABLE

	Youth Services					
	DS	PF	LP	PG	Other	Total
1964						
State Expenditures for AFDC	-	663,110	-	-	221,037	884,147
State Expenditures for AB	-	-	932	-	45,673	46,605
Cost of Program Administration for AFDC and AB	-	95,167	-	-	36,340	131,507
Demonstration Projects	-	978	-	-	326	1,304
All other	-	-	-	-	1,670,634	1,670,634
TOTAL	-	759,955	932	-	1,974,010	2,734,197
1970						
Maintenance Assistance for AFDC	-	1,508,966	-	-	558,111	2,067,077
Maintenance Assistance for AB	-	-	994	-	48,715	49,709
Emergency Assistance	-	3,024	-	-	1,118	4,142
State & Local Administration	-	96,768	-	-	168,349	265,117
All other	-	-	-	-	1,756,394	1,756,394
TOTAL	-	1,608,758	994	-	2,532,687	4,142,439
1976						
TOTAL	-	4,152,578	-	-	1,696,125	5,848,703
1980						
TOTAL	-	4,933,519	-	-	2,114,365	7,047,884

Civil Service Retirement and Disability Fund

HIST # 128300

This account existed in 1964, 1970, 1976, and 1980.

For 1964, 11% of the account funds were allocated for youth based on annuities paid to children as a share of total annuities and benefits reported in the Annual Report of Financial and Statistical Data (U.S. Divil Service Commission, Bureau of Retirement Insurance and Occupational Health, fiscal year 1964, Table A-8). This sum was classified as PF.

For 1970, 10% of the account funds were allocated for youth based on annuities paid to children as a share of total annuities and benefits reported in the Annual Report of Financial and Statistical Data (U.S. Civil Service Commission, fiscal year 1970, Table A-8). This sum was classified as PF.

For 1976, 7% of the funds were allocated for youth based on annuities paid to children as a share of total annuities and benefits reported in the Annual Report of Financial and Statistical Data (U.S. Civil Service Commission, fiscal year 1976, Table B-11). This sum was classified as PF.

For 1980, the youth share was allocated and classified in the same manner as 1976.

SUMMARY TABLE

	Youth Services					
	DS	PF	LP	PG	Other	Total
1964	-	146,331	-	-	1,171,965	1,318,296
1970	-	264,153	-	-	2,487,452	2,751,605
1976	-	555,035	-	-	7,729,074	8,284,109
1980	-	1,018,750	-	-	13,534,817	14,553,567

Cuban Refugee Assistance

HIST # 049500

This account existed in 1964, 1970, 1976, and 1980. In all four years, funds were allocated on the basis of youth as a share of the general population. These sums were classified as LP.

SUMMARY TABLE

	Youth Services					
	DS	PF	LP	PG	Other	Total
1964	-	-	15,537	-	27,030	42,567
1970	-	-	28,595	-	55,262	83,857
1976	-	-	41,815	-	96,190	138,006
1980	-	-	118,814	-	299,545	418,359

Federal Disability Insurance Trust Fund HIST # 049800

This account existed in 1964, 1970, 1976, and 1980.

In all four years, the allocation of funds for youth was based on the same data and classified in the same manner as for the Civil Service Retirement and Disability Fund.

SUMMARY TABLE

	Youth Services					
	DS	PF	LP	PG	Other	Total
1964	-	147,460	-	-	1,193,085	1,340,545
1970	-	42,531	-	-	2,911,412	2,953,943
1976	-	665,728	-	-	8,940,734	9,606,462
1980	-	1,073,724	-	-	14, 265,202	15,338,926

Federal Old Age & Survivors Insurance Trust Fund HIST # 049700

This account existed in 1964, 1970, 1976, and 1980.

For 1964, 9.1% of the funds were allocated for youth based on benefits paid to youth as a share of total benefits paid. This allocation was based on data reported in Social Security Bulletin Annual Statistical Supplement, 1976 (U. S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Social Security Administration, Tables 54 and 98). This sum was classified PF.

For 1970, 8.2% of the account was allocated for youth based on the same data source and classified in the same manner as for 1964.

For 1976, 7.4% of the account was allocated for youth based on data from the same source and classified in the same manner as for 1964.

For 1980, 6.7% of the account was allocated for youth based on unpublished data available from the Social Security Administration, Office of Research and Statistics. This sum was classified as PF.

SUMMARY TABLE

	Youth Services					
	DS	PF	LP	PG	Other	Total
1964	-	1,390,899	-	-	13,893,708	15,284,607
1970	-	2,240,301	-	-	25,080,044	27,320,345
1976	-	4,757,910	-	-	59,538,173	64,296,083
1980	-	6,968,284	-	-	97,035,944	104,004,228

Federal Unemployment Benefits and Allowances HIST # 067100

This account existed in 1964, 1970, 1976, and 1980.

For 1964 and 1970 account funds were allocated for youth based on data relating to "characteristics of insured unemployed and benefits under state programs" presented in U.S. Department of Labor, Manpower Report of the President, April 1971, Table F-17. These figures show that 6% of all beneficiaries were under 22 in 1970. Accordingly, it was estimated that 2% of the funds could be allocated for youth under 18. These sums were classified as LP.

For 1976 account funds were allocated for youth based on similar data reported in U.S. Department of Labor, Employment and Training Report of the President, April 1978, Table F-10. These figures show that 10.4% of all beneficiaries were under 22 in 1976. Accordingly, it was estimated that 3.4% of the funds could be allocated for youth under 18. This sum was classified as LP.

For 1980 account funds were allocated for youth based on similar data reported in U. S. Department of Labor. Employment and Training Report of the President, April 1979, Table F-10. These figures show that 9.6% of the insured unemployed receiving benefits in 1977 were under 22. Accordingly it was estimated that 3.1% of the funds could be allocated for youth under 18. This sum was classified as LP.

SUMMARY TABLE

	Youth Services					
	DS	PF	LP	PG	Other	Total
			1964			
TOTAL	-	-	3,050	-	149,464	152,514
			1970			
TOTAL	-	-	3,671	-	179,883	183,554
			1976			
TOTAL	-	-	64,334	-	1,827,839	1,892,173
			1980			
TOTAL	-	-	31,930	-	998,070	1,030,000

Grants to States for Unemployment Insurance and Employment Services

HIST # 06700

This account existed in 1976 and 1980. For 1976, funds were allocated for youth based on data relating to "Characteristics of Insured Unemployed and Benefits Under State Programs" presented in U. S. Department of Labor, Employment and Training Report of the President, April 1978, Table F-10. These figures showed that 10.4% of all beneficiaries were under 22 in 1976. Accordingly, it was estimated that 3.4% of the funds could be allocated for youth under 18. This sum was classified as LP.

For 1980, funds were allocated for youth based on data relating to "Characteristics of Individuals Placed by the U. S. Employment Services by State FY 1978," presented in U. S. Department of Labor, Employment and Training Report of the President, April 1979, Table F-9. These figures showed that 44% of individuals placed by the U. S. Employment Service were under 22 in 1978. Accordingly, it was estimated that 14.5% of the funds could be allocated for youth under 18. This sum was classified as LP.

SUMMARY TABLE

	Youth Services					
	DS	PF	LP	PG	Other	Total
1976 TOTAL	-	-	6,182	-	175,649	181,831
1980 TOTAL	-	-	3,234	-	19,066	22,300

Judicial Survivors Annuity Fund HIST # 006800

This fund existed in 1964, 1970, 1976, and 1980. In all four years, 1.5% of the account funds were allocated for youth based on the youth share of all annuities and death claims in 1976 as reported by the Administrative Office of the U. S. Court, Division of Personnel, Retirement and Benefits Section. These sums were classified as PF.

SUMMARY TABLE

	Youth Services					
	DS	PF	LP	PG	Other	Total
1964	-	10	-	-	480	490
1970	-	14	-	-	682	696
1976	-	27	-	-	1,328	1,355
1980	-	34	-	-	2,226	2,260

National Life Insurance Fund HIST # 109000

This account existed in 1964, 1970, 1976, and 1980.

For 1964, based on budget data, the account was subdivided into eight programs. For one program—the operating costs funded for death claims—.05% for the account funds were allocated for youth based on death claims paid to youth as a share of all death claims paid. This allocation was made on the basis of data reported by the Veterans Administration, Office of the District Council, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania and the sum was classified as PF. The seven programs in the balance of the account were not classified as services for youth.

For 1970, based on budget data, the account was subdivided into eight programs. For one—the operating costs funded for death claims—.01% of the funds were allocated for youth based on the same data and classified in the same manner as for 1964. The seven programs in the balance of the account were not classified as services for youth.

For 1976, the account was again subdivided into eight programs. For only one—operating costs funded for death claims—.007% of the funds were allocated for youth based on the same data and classified in the same manner as for 1964 and 1970. The seven programs in the balance of the account were not classified as services for youth.

For 1980, the account was allocated for youth and classified in the same manner as in 1976.

National Life Insurance Fund HIST # 109000

SUMMARY TABLE

	Youth Services					
	DS	PF	LP	PG	Other	Total
			1964			
Death Claims	-	88	-	-	294,301	294,389
All others	-	-	-	-	290.878	290.878
TOTAL	-	88	-	-	585,179	585,267
			1970			
Death Claims	-	29	-	-	291,817	291,846
All others	-	-	-	-	393.238	393.238
TOTAL	-	29	-	-	685,055	685,084
			1976			
Death Claims	-	19	-	-	273,443	273,462
All others	-	-	-	-	359.551	359.551
TOTAL	-	19	-	-	632,994	633,013
			1980			
Death Claims	-	25	-	-	361,325	361,350
All others	-	-	-	-	441.650	441.650
TOTAL	-	25	-	-	802,975	803,000

Payments to States for Child Support, Title IV-B

This account existed only in 1980. The allocation of funds for youth was based on a FY 1979 monthly average of the share of AFDC recipients who were children. Data were supplied by the U. S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Division of Family Assistance Services.

SUMMARY TABLE

	Youth Services					
	DS	PF	LP	PG	Other	Total
1980	-	245	-	-	105	350

Railroad Retirement Account HIST # 129900

This account existed in 1964, 1970, 1976, and 1980.

For 1964, 2.8% of the account funds were allocated for youth based on children receiving retirement and survivor benefits as a share of total survivor annuitants. Data for this allocation were reported in the Railroad Retirement Board Annual Report 1964 (Table B-2). This sum was classified as PF.

For 1970, 2.7% of the account funds were allocated for youth on the same basis as for 1964. Data for this allocation were reported in the Railroad Retirement Board Annual Report 1970 (Table 11). This sum was classified as PF.

For 1976, 3% of the account funds were allocated for youth on the same basis as for 1964 and 1970. Data for this allocation were reported in the Railroad Retirement Board Annual Report 1976 (Table 11). This sum was classified as PF.

For 1980, 3% of the account funds were allocated for youth on the same basis as all previous years. Data for this allocation were reported in Railroad Retirement Board Annual Report 1978 (Table 11). This sum was classified as PF.

SUMMARY TABLE

	Youth Services					
	DS	PF	LP	PG	Other	Total
1964	-	30,897	-	-	1,072,575	1,103,472
1970	-	43,283	-	-	1,564,618	1,607,901
1976	-	104,239	-	-	3,370,423	3,474,662
1980	-	143,820	-	-	4,650,180	4,794,000

Special Benefits for Disabled Coal Miners HIST # 049300

This account existed in 1970, 1976, and 1980.

For 1970 based on budget data the account was subdivided into three programs. For two programs--benefit payments and administration--10% of the account funds were allocated to youth based on an estimate of benefits paid to children as a share of all benefit payments. This sum was classified as PF. For the third program, environmental control, 10% of the funds were allocated for youth based on the same estimate of benefit payments to children. This sum was classified as LP. The estimate for allocating funds for the three programs was provided by the Social Security Administration, Office of Research and Statistics.

For 1976, 11.4% of the funds were allocated for youth based on the actual benefits paid to children as a share of total benefits paid reported by the Social Security Administration, Office of Research and Statistics. This sum was classified as PF.

For 1980, 3.1% of funds were allocated for youth based on the actual benefits paid to children as a share of total benefits paid, reported by the Social Security Administration, Office of Research and Statistics. This sum was classified as PF.

SUMMARY TABLE

	Youth Services					
	DS	PF	LP	PG	Other	Total
1970						
Benefit Payments	-	739	-	-	6,652	7,391
Administration	-	290	-	-	2,617	2,907
Environmental Control	-	-	8	-	75	83
TOTAL	-	1,029	8	-	9,344	10,381
1976	-	113,709	-	-	883,745	997,454
1980	-	32,198	-	-	1,006,455	1,038,653

Supplemental Security Income (SSI) HIST # 049200

This account existed in 1976 and 1980. For 1976, 4.3% of the account funds were allocated for youth based on SSI benefit payments to children as a share of all benefit payments, reported by the Social Security Administration, Analysis Branch of the Division of Supplemental Security Income. This sum was classified as LP.

For 1980, 7.9% of the accounts funds were allocated for youth based on the same data and classified in the same manner as for 1976.

SUMMARY TABLE

	Youth Services					
	DS	PF	LP	PG	Other	Total
1976	-	-	217,493	-	4,840,478	5,057,971
1980	-	-	505,578	-	5,894,142	6,399,720

Unemployment Trust Fund

HIST # 067600

This account existed in 1964, 1970, 1976, and 1980.

For 1964 and 1970 account funds were allocated for youth based on data relating to "characteristics of insured unemployed and benefits under state programs" presented in U.S. Department of Labor, Manpower Report of the President, April 1971, Table F-17. These figures show that 6% of all beneficiaries were under 22 in 1970. Accordingly, it was estimated that 2% of the funds could be allocated for youth under 18. These sums were classified as LP.

For 1976 account funds were allocated for youth based on similar data reported in U.S. Department of Labor, Employment and Training Report of the President, April 1978, Table F-10. These figures show that 10.4% of all beneficiaries were under 22 in 1976. Accordingly, it was estimated that 3.4% of the funds could be allocated for youth under 18. This sum was classified as LP.

For 1980, account funds were allocated for youth based on similar data reported in U. S. Department of Labor, Employment and Training Report of the Presidnet, April 1979, Table F-10. These figures show that 9.6% of all beneficiaries were under 22 in 1977. Accordingly, it was estimated that 3.1% of the funds could be allocated for youth under 18. This sum was classified as LP.

SUMMARY TABLE

	Youth Services					
	DS	PF	LP	PG	Other	Total
			1964			
TOTAL	-	-	69,841	-	3,422,227	3,492,068
			1970			
TOTAL	-	-	63,793	-	3,125,859	3,189,652
			1976			
TOTAL	-	-	596,872	-	16,958,189	17,555,061
			1980			
TOTAL	-	-	447,933	-	14,001.519	14,449,452

Veterans Compensation and Benefits HIST # 106500

This account existed in 1964, 1970, 1976, and 1980.

For 1964, 8.2% of the account funds were allocated for youth based on Veterans death and compensation payments for all cases involving children, including widows with children, as a share of total compensation and pension expenditures. This allocation was based on data reported in Annual Report of the Administration of Veterans Affairs (Veterans Administration, 1964) and the sum was classified as PF.

For 1970, 9.9% of the account was allocated for youth on the same basis as for 1964. The allocation was based on data reported in the Annual Report of the Administration of Veterans Affairs (1970) and the sum was classified as PF.

For 1976, 7.3% of the account was allocated for youth on the same basis as for 1964 and 1970. The allocation was based on data reported in the Annual Report of the Administration of Veterans Affairs (1976) and was classified as PF.

For 1980, three accounts - veterans' compensations, pensions and burial benefits - were combined in order to make programmatic breakdowns corresponding to categories in the earlier years. For the entire account, 5.6% of the funds were allocated for youth on the same basis as earlier years. This allocation was based on unpublished data for 1979 made available from the Central Office of the Veterans Administration and was classified as PF.

SUMMARY TABLE

	Youth Services					
	DS	PF	LP	PG	Other	Total
1964	-	288,620	-	-	3,672,586	3,961,206
1970	-	525,482	-	-	4,810,285	5,335,767
1976	-	670,623	-	-	7,507,700	8,178,323
1980	-	569,484	-	-	9,865,220	10,434,704

Veterans Insurance and Indemnities

HIST # 106900

This account existed in 1964, 1970, 1976, and 1980.

For 1964, .03% of the account funds were allocated for youth based on death claims paid to youth as a share of all death claims paid. This allocation was based on data reported by the Veterans Administration, Office of the District Council, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania and the sum was classified as PF.

For 1970, .01% of the account funds were allocated for youth based on the same data and classified in the same manner as for 1964.

For 1976 and 1980 the amount of death claims paid out to youth was considered insignificant.

SUMMARY TABLE

	Youth Services					
	DS	PF	LP	PG	Other	Total
1964	-	8	-	-	26,834	26,842
1970	-	4	-	-	13,460	13,464

Veterans Readjustment Benefits

This account existed in 1964, 1970, 1976, and 1980.

For all four years, based on budget data from the Appendix to the Budget of the U. S., the account was subdivided into two programs. For the readjustment benefits paid to sons and daughters component of the education and training program, 100% of the account was allocated to youth. This sum were classified as DS. The balance of the account in the four years was not classified as services for youth.

SUMMARY TABLE

	Youth Services					
	DS	PF	LP	PG	Other	Total
1964						
Ed. & Training Benefits to Children	24,839	-	-	-	-	24,839
All others	-	-	-	-	44,159	44,159
TOTAL	24,839	-	-	-	44,159	68,998
1970						
Ed. & Training for Sons and Daughters	43,452	-	-	-	-	43,452
All others	-	-	-	-	944,083	944,083
TOTAL	43,452	-	-	-	944,083	987,535
1976						
Ed. & Training for Sons and Daughters	160,270	-	-	-	-	160,270
All others	-	-	-	-	5,366,292	5,366,292
TOTAL	160,270	-	-	-	5,366,292	5,526,562
1980						
Ed. & Training for Sons and Daughters	173,053	-	-	-	-	173,053
All others	-	-	-	-	2,165,497	2,165,497
TOTAL	173,053	-	-	-	2,165,497	2,338,550

U.S. Government Life Insurance Fund

HIST # 109200

This account existed in 1964, 1970, 1976, and 1980.

For 1964, based on budget data, the account was subdivided into five programs. For one program—operating costs funded for death claims—.03% of the account funds were allocated for youth based on death claims paid to youth as a share of all death claims paid. This allocation was made on the basis of data reported by the Veterans Administration, Office of District Council, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania and the sum was classified as PF. The four programs in the balance of the account were not classified as services for youth.

For 1970, based on budget data, the account was subdivided into seven programs. For one—operating costs for death claims—.01% of the funds were allocated for youth based on the same data and calculated in the same manner as for 1964. The balance of the account was not classified as service for children.

For 1976, the account was subdivided into nine programs. For one—operating costs for death claims—.007% of the account was allocated for youth based on the same data and calculated in the same manner as for 1964 and 1970. The balance of the account was not classified as services for children.

For 1980, the account was calculated and classified in the same manner as 1976.

U.S. Government Life Insurance Fund HIST # 109200

SUMMARY TABLE

	Youth Services					
	DS	PF	LP	PG	Other	Total
			1964			
Death Claims	-	13	-	-	43,826	43,839
All others	-	-	-	-	53.365	53.364
TOTAL	-	13	-	-	97,191	97,203
			1970			
Death Claims	-	4	-	-	42,422	42,426
All others	-	-	-	-	41.752	41.752
TOTAL	-	4	-	-	84,174	84,178
			1976			
Death Claims	-	3	-	-	40,779	40,782
All others	-	-	-	-	30.512	30.512
TOTAL	-	3	-	-	71,291	71,294
			1980			
Death Claims	-	3	-	-	41,904	41,907
All others	-	-	-	-	26.793	26.793
TOTAL	-	3	-	-	68,697	68,700

Law Enforcement Assistance Administration (LEAA)

HIST # 066200

This account existed in 1970, 1976, and 1980.

For 1970 the account was subdivided into six programs. For two--matching grants and administration--20% of the funds were allocated for youth based on estimates supplied by the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, LEAA, Department of Justice. These sums were classified as LP. The same 20% figure was used to allocate funds for youth from two other programs: grants for development of comprehensive plans and academic assistance. These sums were classified as PG. The two remaining programs--the National Institute of Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice and the National Criminal Justice Information and Statistics Service--were not classified as services for youth.

For 1976, 20% of the entire account was allocated for youth and classified as LP.

For 1980, the account was subdivided into ten programs. For juvenile justice formula grants and juvenile justice programs, 100% of the funds were allocated as a direct service to youth (DS). Funds for corrections formula grants were determined not to be a service for children. For the remainder of the programs, the funds were allocated based on youth as a share of the population and classified as LP.

Law Enforcement Assistance Administration (LEAA) HIST # 066200

SUMMARY TABLE

	Youth Services					
	DS	PF	LP	PG	Other	Total
			1970			
Grants for Development of Comprehensive Plans	-	-	-	3,229	12,915	16,144
Matching Grants	-	-	4,005	-	16,014	20,019
Academic Assistance		-	-	4,133	16,531	20,664
Administration	-	-	904	-	3,616	7,749
All Other	-	-	-	-	-3,229	3,229
TOTAL	-	-	4,909	7,362	52,305	64,576
			1976			
TOTAL	-	-	184,050	-	736,505	920,555
			1980			
Juvenile Justice Formula Grants	68,179	-	-	-	-	68,179
Juvenile Justice Programs	43,386	-	-	-	-	43,386
Correction Formula Grants	-	-	-	-	37,188	37,188
All Other	-	-	133,779	-	337,273	471,052
TOTAL	111,565	-	133,779	-	374,461	619,805

Child Nutrition Programs HIST # 024400

This account existed in 1964, 1970, 1976, and 1980. In all four years, 100% of the program funds were allocated to children and youth and classified as DS.

SUMMARY TABLE

	Youth Services					
	DS	PF	LP	PG	Other	Total
1964	180,664	-	-	-	-	180,664
1970	299,131	-	-	-	-	299,131
1976	1,801,566	-	-	-	-	1,801,566
1980	3,290,134	-	-	-	-	3,290,134

Food Donations Program HIST # 023900

This account existed in 1976 and 1980.

For 1976, based on budget data, the account was subdivided into three programs. For the direct distribution to needy families component of the commodity acquisition program, 54.1% of the funds were allocated to children and youth based on the share of food stamp recipients under 18. Data were supplied by the Food and Nutrition Service, USDA. The same method and basis of allocation of expenditures was applied to the cash assistance program. These sums were classified as PF.

For the supplemental food program component of the commodity acquisitions activity, the allocation for children and youth was based on preliminary data in the forthcoming publication, WIC Participation Profile Study (Food and Nutrition Service, Office of Policy Planning and Evaluation). The study estimated that 80% of the beneficiaries of the WIC program are infants and children. This share was classified as PF.

For operating expenses, funds were allocated to children and youth in proportion to the aggregate amounts for the other programs in this hist fund account.

For 1980, based on budget data, the account was divided into two programs. For the direct distribution to needy families component of the commodity acquisition program, 54.8% of the funds were allocated to children and youth based on the share of food stamp recipients under 18 reported in Characteristics of Food Stamp Households, September 1976 (U.S.D.A., Food and Nutrition Service, FNS-168, 1977). This sum was classified as DF.

The second program, elderly feeding, did not provide services to youth.

SUMMARY TABLE

	Youth Services					
	DS	PF	LP	PG	Other	Total
1976 TOTAL	-	4,886	-	-	2,890	7,776
1980 TOTAL	-	24,417	-	-	79,203	103,620

Food Stamp Program HIST # 024100

This account existed in 1964, 1970, 1976, and 1980.

In 1964 and 1970, 54.1% of the program funds were allocated to children and youth based on the share of food stamp recipients under 18 as reported by the Food and Nutrition Service. These sums were classified as PF.

For 1976, the method and basis of allocation of expenditures was the same as for 1964 and 1970. Three of the four programs were classified as PF. The fourth, matching for state administration, was classified as PG.

For 1980, 54.8% of the account funds were allocated for youth based on data reported in Characteristics of Food Stamp Households, September 1976 (U.S. Department of Agriculture, Food and Nutrition Service, FNS-168, 1977). The sum for matching for state administration was classified as PG. All other funds in the balance of the account were classified as PF.

SUMMARY TABLE

	Youth Services					
	DS	PF	LP	PG	Other	Total
1964	-	16,472	-	-	13,976	30,448
1970	-	312,054	-	-	264,756	576,810
1976						
Matching for State Administration	-	-	-	91,407	77,552	168,959
All others	-	2,955,481	-	-	2,507,514	5,462,995
TOTAL	-	2,955,481	-	91,407	2,585,066	5,631,954
1980						
Matching for State Administration	-	-	-	285,333	235,347	520,680
All others	-	4,470,211	-	-	3,687,109	8,157,326
TOTAL	-	4,470,211	-	285,333	3,922,456	8,678,000

Special Milk Fund HIST # 023800

This account existed in 1964, 1970, 1976, and 1980. In all four years, 100% of the programs funds were allocated to children and youth and classified as DS.

SUMMARY TABLE

	Youth Services					
	DS	PF	LP	PG	Other	Total
			1964			
TOTAL	97,097	-	-	-	-	97,097
			1970			
TOTAL	83,800	-	-	-	-	83,800
			1976			
TOTAL	88,710	-	-	-	-	88,710
			1980			
TOTAL	149,600	-	-	-	-	149,600

Special Supplementary Food Program (WIC) HIST # 024300

This account existed only in 1976 and 1980. For 1976, the allocation for youth was based on preliminary data in the forthcoming publication, WIC Participation Profile Study (Food and Nutrition Service, Office of Policy Planning and Evaluation), which estimated that 80% of the beneficiaries of the WIC program were infants and children. This share was classified as PF.

For 1980, 78% of the funds were allocated for youth based on the share of children participating in the special supplemental food program in 1980 as reported in the Budget of the United States Government Appendix Fiscal Year 1981, p. 196.

SUMMARY TABLE

	Youth Services					
	DS	PF	LP	PG	Other	Total
1976	-	114,037	-	-	28,509	142,546
1980	-	573,347	-	-	161,713	735,060

Bureau of Land Management Development and Operation of Recreation Facilities HIST # 053800

This account existed in 1964, 1976, and 1980. For all years, program funds were allocated for children and youth based on youth as a share of the general population. These sums were classified as LP.

SUMMARY TABLE

	Youth Services					
	DS	PF	LP	PG	Other	Total
1964	-	-	259	-	451	710
1976	-	-	68	-	158	226
1980	-	-	85	-	215	300

Forest Service Construction and Operation of Recreation Facilities HIST # 025300

This account existed only in 1976 and 1980. Funds in those years were allocated for children and youth based on youth as a share of the general population. This sum was classified as LP.

SUMMARY TABLE

	Youth Services					
	DS	PF	LP	PG	Other	Total
1976	-	-	833	-	1,917	2,750
1980	-	-	1,044	-	2,631	3,675

JFK Center for Performing Arts HIST # 057800

This account existed in 1970, 1976, and 1980. In all years, funds were allocated for children and youth based on youth as a share of the general population. These sums were classified as LP.

SUMMARY TABLE

	Youth Services					
	DS	PF	LP	PG	Other	Total
1970	-	-	3,722	-	7,194	10,916
1976	-	-	768	-	1,766	2,534
1980	-	-	1,163	-	2,933	4,096

National Park Service Planning. Development and Operation of Recreation Facilities

HIST # 058100

This account existed in 1976 and 1980. For each year, program funds were allocated for children and youth based on youth as a share of the general population. These sums were classified as LP.

SUMMARY TABLE

	Youth Services					
	DS	PF	LP	PG	Other	Total
1976	-	-	4,896	-	11,262	16,158
1980	-	-	4,998	-	12,599	17,597

Operation of the National Park Service HIST # 057600

This account existed in 1964, 1970, 1976, and 1980.

For 1964, based on budget data, the account was subdivided into three programs: general administration, maintenance and rehabilitation, and management and protection. Allocation of funds for youth from the three programs was based on youth as a share of the general population. The sums for two components of the management and protection program--forestry and fire control and soil moisture conservation--were classified as PG. The balance of the account funds for youth was classified as LP.

For 1970, the account was subdivided into three programs: management and protection, maintenance and rehabilitation, and general administrative expenses. Allocation of funds for youth from the three programs was based on youth as a share of the general population. The sums for the forestry and fire control component of the management and protection program were classified as PG. The balance of the account funds for youth was classified as LP.

For 1976, the account was subdivided into six programs. Allocation of funds for youth from all programs was based on youth as a share of the general population. The sum for the forest fire suppression program was classified as PG. The balance of the account funds for youth was classified as LP.

For 1980, based on budget data, the account was subdivided into six programs. Allocation of funds for youth from all programs was based on youth as a share of the general population. The sum for the fire suppression program was classified as PG and the balance of the account funds were classified as LP.

SUMMARY TABLE

	Youth Services					
	DS	PF	LP	PG	Other	Total
			1964			
Forestry and Fire Control	-	-	-	593	1,032	1,625
Soil & Moisture Conservation	-	-	-	75	130	205
All other	-	-	18. 064	-	31.427	49.491
TOTAL	-	-	18, 064	668	32,589	51.321
			1970			
Forestry and Fire Control	-	-	-	994	1,921	2,915
All other	-	-	32.138	-	62.109	94.247
TOTAL	-	-	32,138	994	64,030	97,162
			1976			
Forest Fire Suppression	-	-	-	752	1,730	2.482
All other	-	-	74,437	-	171229	245.666
TOTAL	-	-	74,437	752	172,959	248.148
			1980			
Forest Fire Suppression	-	-	-	332	837	1,169
All other	-	-	108,494	-	273.528	382.022
TOTAL	-	-	108,494	332	274,365	383,191

Recreational and Fish and Wildlife Facilities

HIST # 054700

This account existed in 1964, 1970, 1976, and 1980.

In all four years, program funds were allocated for children and youth based on youth as a share of the general population. These sums were classified as LP.

SUMMARY TABLE

	Youth Services					
	DS	PF	LP	PG	Other	Total
1964	-	-	902	-	1,570	2,472
1970	-	-	982	-	1,898	2,880
1976	-	-	585	-	1,346	1,931
1980	-	-	57	-	143	200

Urban Parks and Recreation Grants

This account existed only in 1980. For that year funds were allocated for children and youth based on youth as a share of the general population. This sum was classified as LP.

SUMMARY TABLE

	Youth Services					
	DS	DF	LP	PG	Other	Total
1980	-	-	4,828	-	12,172	17,000

Appendix II

Distribution of Selected Expenditures for Youth Aged 18-24

Expenditures for youth aged 18-24 were divided into two categories - employment and higher education. Employment expenditures were generally based on the share of program monies for 18-24 year olds; higher education monies included expenditures under the Higher Education Histfund accounts.

Employment

In 1964, two Histfund accounts, Employment and Training and UI Trust Fund (Training and Employment) included employment expenditures for 19-24 year-olds. For UI Trust Funds (Training and Employment) the share for 18 -24 year-olds was interpolated from Employment Service estimates that 41% of the program participants were under 22 (Department of Labor, U. S. Employment Service). Accordingly, it was estimated that 405% of the funds could be allocated for youth, 18-24. For Employment and Training, the share for 18-24 year-olds was based on estimates that 38% of program participants in 1964 were under 21. (Manpower Report of the President, 1965). Accordingly, it was estimated that 43% of the funding for this account could be allocated for youth.

In 1970, three accounts included employment expenditures for 18-24 year-olds. For WIN, the share of expenditures was based on data indicating that 23% of the program participants were under 22. (Manpower Report of the President, 1971, Table F-12, p. 310). Accordingly, it was estimated that 23% of the funding was distributed to 18-24 year-olds. For UI Trust Fund, the share for 18-24 year-olds was based on estimates from the U. S. Employment Services, Department of Labor, which indicated that 40.5% of the recipients of employment services were between 18-24. For Employment and Training, the share for 18-24 year-olds was based on program and budget data showing that 46.4% of the 1970 MDTA enrollees were under 22. (Manpower Report of the President, 1971, Table F-3,F-6, F-8). Accordingly, it was estimated that 73% of the funds were allocated to 18-24 year-olds. For Community Services, the allocation for 18-24 year-olds was based on CSA estimates of 6% funding for this age group. (Community Services Administration, "Summary of 1975 CAA Sample Survey").

In 1976, seven Histfund accounts included employment expenditures for 18-24 year-olds. For Temporary Employment Assistance, the share for 18-24 year-olds was based on Employment and Training Data which indicated that 22% of CETA Title UI enrollees were between 16-22 years of age. (Department of Labor, Employment and Training Administration, Office of Administration and Management). Thus, it was estimated that 23 of the funds were allocated for 18-24 year-olds. For WIN, the share for 19-24 year-olds was interpolated from unpublished data which showed that 17.4% of 1976 WIN registrants were under 22; it was estimated that 18.3% of the funding was allocated to 18-24 year-olds. (Department of Labor, Employment and Training Administration, Office of Administration and Management). The allocation for 18-24 year-olds for UI Trust Fund (Training and Employment) was interpolated from U. S. Employment Service Data showing that 41% of the recipients of employment services were under 22. (Employment and Training Report of the President, 1977, Table F-9). It was therefore estimated that 41% of the funding was allocated to the 18-24 year-old cohort. Estimates for the share of funding for 18-24 year-olds for Community Services were based on 1975 CSA data indicating that 13% of the funding was allocated for this group. (Community Services Administration, "Summary of 1975 CAA Sample Survey", 1976). For Job Opportunities, the share of funding for 18-24 year-olds was based on an unpublished survey of enrollees indicating that 35% were between 18-24. (U. S. Department of Commerce, Economic Development Administration "An Evaluation of the Direct Impacts of the Job Opportunities Program, Title X", Program Evaluation Division, 1979). Estimates for the share for 19-24 year-olds for Employment and Training were based on interpolations from Employment and Training program and budget data indicating that 65% of the enrollees in 1976 were under 22. Thus it was estimated that 59% of the funding was distributed to 18-24 year-olds. (Employment and Training Administration, Office of Administration and Management).

In 1980, five Histfund accounts included employment expenditures for 18-24 year olds. For Temporary Employment Assistance, the share for 18-24 year olds was based on Employment and Training Administration data which indicated that 30.5% of the participants in CETA programs were between 18-24. (U. S. Department of Labor, Employment and Training Administration, Quarterly Summary of Participant Characteristics, January, 1980.) For WIN, 16.9% of the funds was estimated for 18-24 year olds based on the share of program participants under 44 and under 19. (Employment and Training Report of the President, 1979; Table 6: WIN Registrants and Job Entrants by Selected Characteristics, FY 1978.) For Unemployment Trust Fund (Training and Employment, 44% of the funds was allocated for youth under 22 based on data from the U. S. Employment Services. Accordingly, it was estimated that 40% of the funds for U.I. Training and Employment was allocated for youth, 18-24. (Employment and Training Report of the President, 1979; Table F-9: Characteristics of Individuals Placed by the U. S. Employment Service, by State, Fiscal Year (1979.) For Job Opportunities, 35% of the funds was allocated for 18-24 year olds based on a survey of enrollees. (U. S. Department of Commerce, Economic Development Administration, "An Evaluation of the Direct Impacts of the Job Opportunities Program, Title X," Program Evaluation Division, 1979.) For Employment and Training Assistance, 30.5% of the funds was estimated for youth, 18-24, based on the quarterly summary of participant characteristics prepared in January, 1980. (U. S. Department of Labor, Employment and Training Administration, Quarterly Summary of Participant Characteristics.)

Education

The share for higher education expenditures for 18-24 year olds is based on total expenditures in eight Higher Education Histfund accounts. These include the following accounts: Student Financial Assistance, Higher and Continuing Education, Student Loan Insurance, National Institute for the Deaf, Callaudet College, Howard University, Higher Education Facilities Loan and Insurance, and College Housing Loans.

Appendix III

Sources and Methods for Estimating Public Expenditures for Services to Children and Youth in New York City

A. Expenditures by Local Government

1. City of New York
2. New York City Housing Authority

B. New York State Direct Expenditures in New York City

C. Federal Outlays in New York City

A-1. Expenditures by the City of New York

Expenditures for the City of New York for fiscal year 1978 (July, 1977 - June, 1978) were identified from the "Budget As Modified FY1978" columns of the Executive Budget, Fiscal Year 1979, Supporting Schedules prepared by the Office of Management and Budget, City of New York.

According to this document total expenditures for FY 1978 were $14,394,351,023. Of this total $2,201,294,273 was for pension and debt service items that could not be related to the provision of services. Hence these items were excluded from the analysis leaving an "allocable" budget total of $12,193,056,750.

Within the "allocable" budget a total of $10,457,140,040 represents the budget total for 28 agencies (including Miscellaneous) which were found to provide services to children and youth. Of the remainder $644,446,418 was for agencies providing indirect services such as building inspections or street cleaning and $791,470,292 was for agencies providing overhead services to City agencies.

The remainder of this appendix describes the method used to identify the share of the budget devoted to youth services for each of the 28 agencies providing such services and to identify the functional distribution of these services. The total amounts and youth shares are summarized in Table A-1. The functional distribution of youth shares for each agency is summarized in Table .A-2.

TABLE A-1

NEW YORK CITY AGENCIES PROVIDING DIRECT SERVICES TO YOUTH
Fiscal Year 1978

Agency	Total Agency Expenditures	Youth Expenditures	Youth Share of Agency Total	Agency Share of Total Direct Youth Expenditures
Board of Education	$ 2,603,350,280	$2,453,450,074	94.2%	49.3%
Human Resources Administration/ Department of Social Services (HRA/DSS) 1	3,113,746,650	1,371,319,652	44.0	27.6
Miscellaneous 2	971,276,247	295,078,645	30.4	5.9
Charitable Institutions Budget	605,409,280	299,340,165	49.9	6.0
Health and Hospitals Corporation	805,268,064	124,993,709	15.5	2.5
Department of Employment	219,729,659	78,520,500	35.7	1.6
Department of Health	159,332,752	76,360,348	47.9	1.5
Police Department	897,332,353	70,510,099	7.8	1.4
Department of Mental Health, Mental Retardation and Alcoholism Services	97,801,369	46,733,510	47.8	.9
Department of Parks and Recreation	112,879,453	41,720,758	37.0	.8
Libraries	62,905,905	36,858,214	58.6	.7
Department of Correction	108,366,788	19,721,245	18.2	.4
Department of Probation	22,904,364	11,622,770	50.7	.2
Community Development Agency	39,851,291	10,509,470	26.4	.2
Mayoralty (Youth Board only) 3	8,015,469	8,015,469	100.0	.2
Department of Cultural Affairs	24,849,454	6,850,763	27.6	.1
Criminal Justice Coordinating Council	18,348,911	4,878,976	26.6	.1
Office of Model Cities	35,145,572	4,770,530	13.6	.1
Board of Higher Education	478,906,989	3,698,000	.8	.1
District Attorney - Kings County	12,018,608	1,853,031	15.4	.0
Law Department (Family Court only) 4	1,681,437	1,681,437	100.0	.0
District Attorney - Bronx County)	7,393,658	1,105,961	15.0	.0
District Attorney - New York County	13,549,311	919,513	6.8	.0
District Attorney - Queens County	5,309,863	732,357	13.8	.0
Department for the Aging	29,262,893	354,823	1.2	.0
District Attorney - Richmond County	829,550	138,204	16.7	.0
Commission on Human Rights 5	1,301,850	130,185	10.0	.0
Board of Correction	372,020	67,704	18.2	.0
TOTAL	$10,457,140,040	$4,971,936,112	47.5	100.0

NOTES: 1. Although HRA and DSS have discrete budgets, they have been considered as a single unit to reflect the actual organization. DSS is the direct service arm of HRA. The Department of Employment and the Community Development Agency have been considered separately from HRA/DSS since they are no longer administratively part of HRA.

2. The total Miscellaneous expenditures were $1,174,855,577. The remainder was classified as an Overhead Agency.

3. The total expenditures for the Mayoralty were $36,605,415. The remainder is classified as an Overhead Agency.

4. The total expenditures for the Law Department were $17,369,943. The remainder is classified as an Overhead Agency.

5. The total expenditures for the Commission of Human Rights were $2,753,961. The remainder is classified as an Overhead Agency.

TABLE A-2

AGENCY EXPENDITURES FOR POPULATION UNDER 18 BY FUNCTIONAL CATEGORY

	Education	Employment/ Training	Health/ Mental Health	Income Assistance/ Housing	Justice	Nutrition	Recreation	Child Care/ Protective Services	Agency Totals
	$	$	$	$	$	$	$	$	$
Board of Education									2,453,450,074
Instructional	2,321,300,710								
School Lunch Program						126,906,189			
After School Programs							5,243,175		
Human Resources Admin./ Dept. of Social Services (HRA/DSS)									1,371,319,652
Medical Assistance			163,511,926						
Income Assistance				930,015,377					
Food Stamps (w/o admin.)						6,850,674			
Foster Care/Day Care								270,941,675	
Miscellaneous									
Payments to Legal Aid Society					1,689,259				1,689,259
Fringe Benefits & COLA	148,161,640	4,987,619	31,979,443	58,971,267	7,334,735	8,508,292	3,814,062	29,632,[illegible]	293,389,386
Charitable Institutions Budget									299,340,165
Services to Medically Indigent-Hospitals			99,998,116						
Payments to Voluntary Child Care Agencies								199,342,049	
Health & Hospitals Corp.			124,993,709						124,993,709
Dept. of Employment		78,520,500							78,520,500
Dept. of Health			76,360,348						76,360,348
Police Department									70,510,099
PAL							163,912		
Remaining Dept. Activities					70,346,187				
Dept. of Mental Health, Mental Retardation & Alcoholism Services			46,733,510						46,733,510

(Continued)

(Continuation of Table A-2)

	Education	Employment/ Training	Health/ Mental Health	Income Assistance/ Housing	Justice	Nutrition	Recreation	Child Care/ Protective Services	Agency Totals
	$	$	$	$	$	$	$	$	
Dept. of Parks & Recreation							41,720,758		41,720,758
Libraries	36,858,214								36,858,214
Dept. of Correction					19,721,245				19,721,245
Dept. of Probation					11,622,770				11,622,770
Community Development Agency									
Employment/Training		1,551,252							
Housing & Community Improvement Programs				8,958,218					10,509,470
Mayoralty (Youth Board Only)	1,610,804	902,443	265,318				4,554,623	682,201	8,015,469
Dept. of Cultural Affairs									
Brooklyn Children's Museum							493,373		
Other Cultural Institutions & Programs							6,357,390		6,850,763
Criminal Justice Coordinating Council					4,878,976				4,878,976
Office of Model Cities									
Health Programs			914,258						
Education Programs	622,625								
Employment Programs		570,718							4,770,530
Housing & Community Improvement Programs				2,662,929					
Board of Higher Education Hunter Schools	3,698,000								3,698,000
District Attorney-Kings County					1,853,031				1,853,031
Law Department (Family Court Only)					1,681,437				1,681,437
District Attorney - Bronx County					1,105,961				1,105,961
District Attorney - New York County					919,513				919,513
District Attorney - Queens County					732,357				732,357

(Continued)

(Continuation of Table . A-2)

	Education $	Employment/ Training $	Health/ Mental Health $	Income Assistance/ Housing $	Justice $	Nutrition $	Recreation $	Child Care/ Protective Services	Agency Totals
Dept. for the Aging Foster Grandparents								354,823	354,823
District Attorney - Richmond County					138,204				138,204
Commission on Human Rights Neighborhood Stabilization				130,185					130,185
Board of Correction					67,704				67,704
TOTALS	$2,512,251,993	$86,532,532	$544,756,628	$1,000,737,976	$122,091,379	$142,265,155	$62,347,293	$500,953,156	$4,971,936,112

A. Board of Education

The youth share consists of the entire budget less debt service payments, less $5,551,178 transferred to the Fashion Institute of Technology which serves persons over age 18, and less payments of $144,349,028 for transportation services to and from school.

B. Human Resources Administration/Department of Social Services

The Department of Social Services is the direct service arm of the Human Resources Administration. Two distinct agencies have been maintained for technical reasons and there are separate budgets. However, there is a single Administrator/Commissioner, and there is no division in terms of programs. For that reason, these two agencies have been merged in order to allocate expenditures based on program data.

The Human Resources Administration/Department of Social Services has five basic components. These were allocated as follows:

1) All expenditures for Family and Adult Services (serving only clients over 18) were excluded.

2&3) All expenditures for Special Services for Children (foster care) and for Child Development (day care and Headstart), were allocated for youth.

4) Medical Assistance payments were allocated according to the national distribution of Medical expenditures by age group (see "Age Differences in Health Care Spending, FY 1976," Social Security Bulletin, August, 1977, Vol. 40, No. 8, Table 3). Accordingly 17.2% of medical assistance expenditures were allocated for youth under 18. In addition all Child Health Assurance

Program expenditures and related administrative costs were allocated to youth.

5) Income Assistance payments were allocated in three ways based on data for January 1978 from the "Monthly Statistical Report, New York City Human Resources Administration, January, 1979."

   a) Aid to Dependent Children payments were allocated according to the proportion of recipients who were children (under 18 except for a few 18-21 year olds attending school while living at home).

   b) Home Relief payments were allocated according to the proportion of recipients under 18. Children under 21 represented 13.286% of the recipients, which was adjusted to 11.388% for recipients under 18, assuming an even age distribution.

   c) SSI payments were allocated according to the proportion of recipients under 18 (4.28%).

In addition to the five basic components, the following items in the DSS/HRA budget were also included in the youth share of the agency budget:

- A proportion of food stamp administrative costs equal to the share of food stamp recipients estimated to be under 18 (49%).
- All administrative expenditures for the Bureau of Child Support.
- Other federal operations and administrative expenditures in proportion to the youth share of all other

22J

agency expenditures. They were allocated to a functional category on the same proportional basis

C. Miscellaneous

The following items are included within the Miscellaneous budget:

1) Personal Services (i.e., Cost of Living Adjustments and salary and wage adjustments) allocated according to the distribution of total City PS expenditures (except those included within Miscellaneous) for youth services as reflected in all other agency budgets (see above and below).

2) Fringe Benefits were allocated in three different ways.

   a) The Contingent Reserve Fund for the New York City Employees Retirement System was allocated according to the youth share (35.5%) of total PS expenditures, excluding the Fire Department, Police Department, and Board of Education which have separate retirement systems.

   b) Payments to the Cultural Institutions Retirement System were allocated according to the youth share (27.6%) of the expenditures of the Department of Cultural Affairs.

   c) The City contribution for other fringe benefits was allocated according to the youth share of total City PS expenditures (except those included within Miscellaneous).

3) Of payments to maintain Legal Aid Society, which only support activities in Criminal Court, 10% were allocated to youth based on the percent of total arrests in New York City represented by 16 and 17 year olds. Information was drawn from the New York State

- 1977 - "Uniform Crime Report Adult Arrests by County."

4) All other items in the Miscellaneous budget were excluded.

D. Charitable Institutions Budget

The Charitable Institutions Budget includes payments to voluntary child care agencies (foster care) and payments to private hospitals for services to the medically indigent.

a) Payments for private hospitals were allocated to youth on the basis of the share (24%) of medicaid reimbursements to voluntary hospitals for inpatient and outpatient visits of youth. [See "Hospital Payment Statement for January, 1978, Reimbursement Summary (Medical Claims, Voluntary Hospitals)" and Medicaid Management Information System Payment Summary.]

b) All payments to voluntary child care agencies were allocated for child care and social services of children under 18, although in a few special cases, these payments for foster care may include children between the ages of 18 and 21.

E. Health and Hospitals Corporation

For the Health and Hospitals Corporation, 15.5% of New York City payments to HHC (excluding debt service) were allocated for youth under 18. This estimate was based on a system of weighted In-Patient Service Units, which included inpatient days, outpatient visits, emergency room visits and newborn days. Based on data from the "1978 Patient Characteristic Study, Manhattan, Brooklyn, Queens, Acute Care Hospitals," and "Hospital Statistical Notes #3, 1979 Patient Characteristics Study Bronx Hospital, FY 1978 Sample Survey;" it was estimated that youth under 18 represented 20%

of the total inpatient days. In 1977, for outpatient visits, the share for youth under 18 was based on the share of outpatient visits for pediatrics ("Hospitals Statistical Notes #5, 1978, Outpatient Services Utilization, All Hospitals, All Boroughs, Total Visits, 1972") which was applied to the average daily cumulative visits for July, 1977 to February, 1978. ("Ambulatory Care, Outpatient Department Total Doctor Visits.") The same percent was used to calculate the number of Daily Emergency Room visits for youth under 18 from data provided by this report. The number and percent of newborn days was based on "Inpatient Utilization Data" for the average Daily Cumulative Census for July, 1977 to February, 1977.

The appropriate weights for each component were calculated to determine the annual WIPSU's for youth for each hospital and applied to unit cost data for the appropriate institution. ("Quarterly Management Report" October to December, 1978, Health and Hospitals Corporation.)

F. Department of Employment

The Department of Employment administers the Comprehensive Employment Training Act Program (CETA), the Work Incentive Program, the Youth Employment Program, and a variety of city-wide manpower training and employment services. Based on data from the "Draft Employment Training Council Staff Report on the Need for Publicly Funded Manpower Services" in New York City, 32% of the expenditures for CETA II and VI programs were allocated for youth. For all other programs including CETA I, YETP, YCCIP, HIRE, STIP I and Summer Youth, 39% of the expenditures were allocated to employment for youth. Administrative services for the Department of Employment were allocated in proportion to youth expenditures for these programs.

G. Department of Health

For the Department of Health, expenditures are divided into three categories: public health services, other health related services, and administrative expenses.

Public Health services includes five programs for youth. (a) Maternal and child health services - 100% of the funds were allocated for youth. (b) District Health - based on estimates from the Department and the 1978 Mayor's Management Plan, 80% of District Health Services, Nursing Services, and Laboratory expenditures were allocated for youth, as were 25% of VD clinic expenditures. (c) HRA medical assistance - 31% of the expenditures for medical assistance were distributed to youth based on the DCSS/HRA allocation of medical assistance payments (see above). (d) Lead poisoning programs - 100% of funds were allocated to youth. (c) Environmental Health Services - 26% of funds were allocated to youth based on their share of the population.

Other health related services included three programs. (a) Prison Health - based on the age distribution of inmates in Department of Corrections facilities, 9.6% of prison health expenditures were allocated for youth. (b) Addiction Services - 39% of the funds were distributed to youth based on data supplied by the Department of Health. (c) Health Education - 80% of the funds were allocated for youth.

Administrative expenses were allocated to youth based on the combined youth share of all other departmental funds.

H. Police Department

Estimates for youth expenditures for the Police Department are based on two data sources. For police precinct operations which include arrests, inspection, and criminal justice activities, 7.5% of the total was allocated for youth on the basis of the proportion of arrests of under 18 year olds for all crimes and violations. ("Monthly Crime Comparison Reports, FY 1978, Police Department.") Of Youth Aid Division expenditures, 80% were allocated for youth. All expenditures for the Police Athletic League were allocated for children under 18. Administrative expenses were allocated to youth based on the youth share (7.8%) of all other agency funds.

I. Department of Mental Health, Mental Retardation, and Alcoholism Services

The major expenditures of Department of Mental Health, Mental Retardation, and Alcoholism Services are payments to City and non-City agencies to provide services.

Youth expenditures for the Department of Mental Health, Mental Retardation, and Alcoholism Services were divided among seven program categories. (a) Payments to the Board of Education - 100% of expenditures were allocated to youth. (b) Payments to the Health and Hospitals Corporation - the share of expenditures was allocated to youth based on psychiatric inpatient census data for youth provided by HHC. Accordingly, it was estimated that 34% of the funds were allocated for youth under 18. (c) Department of Health's prison health program - youth share was estimated at 9.6% based on the number of inmates under 18 in City Correctional Facilities. (d) Contracts to non-city agencies - 47% of the funds were allocated to youth according to FY 1978 and 1979 Department of Mental Health data on patient characteristics. (e) Family Court - 100% of expenditures were allocated for youth. (f) Criminal Court expenditures - 6% of the funds were allocated to youth on the basis of the proportion of arrests for 16 and 17 year olds. (g) Administrative expenses were allocated according to the youth share of all other agency programs (47%).

J. Department of Parks and Recreation

For the Department of Parks and Recreation, total youth expenditures were distributed within three categories. (a) For the Children's Zoo, 100% of the expenditures were distributed to youth. (b) The remaining expenditures, with the exception of those programs specifically for senior citizens, were allocated for youth on the basis of the youth share of the population. (c) Executive management was allocated to youth in proportion to the youth share of other agency expenditures (37%).

K. Libraries

The Libraries do not maintain information on the age distribution of visitors to their facilities. Circulation statistics only distinguish between juvenile and adult books. This information is not relevant since children will graduate from juvenile books at various ages, depending on their reading skills, but hopefully before high school.

On the basis of a phone survey and statistics detailing the attendance at library programs, expenditures were allocated 60% for youth and 40% for non-youth services. The Research Libraries, primarily serving the population over 18, were allocated to non-youth services.

L. Department of Correction

For the Department of Corrections, estimates of operations expenditures for youth were based on census data from all facilities for youth between 16 and 20. Since discrete age data was not available, estimates of expenditures for 16 and 17 year olds were calculated as a share of the total adolescent population for each facility. For the court expense, 9.7% of operations expenditures were allocated for youth; for Rikers Island Headquarters, 27.4% for youth. Based on the share of youth expenditures for operations in all institutions, 27.4% of administrative expenditures were allocated for youth.

M. Department of Probation

Department of Probation expenditures were allocated according to information submitted to the Mayor's Blue Ribbon Committee on Youth Services and discussions with agency personnel.

All funds for court-related services to youth were allocated for youth, as was 29% of court related services for adults. The combined share of court-related services for youth was then applied to executive management, central operations division, court accounting, and collection expenditures and OTPS expenditures.

N. Community Development Agency

The Community Development Agency is the administrative arm of the Council Against Poverty. This agency administers payments to the City's Anti-Poverty Agencies, implementing the policies of the Council.

For the Community Development Agency, 33% of expenditures were allocated for youth employment programs. The remaining payments to the Anti-Poverty Agencies were allocated to youth according to population data (26%). Administrative expenditures were allocated according to the distribution of the payments to Anti-Poverty Agencies.

O. Mayoralty - Youth Board

The New York City Youth Board is included within the Office of the Mayor. For this analysis, this specific youth service was examined, and the remaining expenditures for the Mayoralty were excluded.

The Youth Board contracts with delegate agencies which provide a wide range of services to youth. According to the Agency Service Statements for FY 1978, the Youth Board awarded 175 contracts totaling $4,899,295. These programs serve a wide range of geographic areas and client populations. Some of the programs do serve the 18-21 age cohort. However, the information was not readily available to determine which programs serve this group or the extent of their participation. Therefore, all Youth Board expenditures have been allocated to youth under 18.

According to Agency Service statements for FY 1978, approximately 20% of Youth Board expenditures were allocated for educational programs, 11% of expenditures were allocated for employment programs

233

for youth, 3.3% was allocated to health programs, 56% were allocated to recreation and cultural enrichment. Contracts for familial and intergenerational services and homeless youth represented approximately 9% of total Youth Board contracts.

P. Department of Cultural Affairs

The Department of Cultural Affairs awards grants to various cultural institutions (museums, cultural associations, etc.) and performing arts groups (dance companies, theater groups, opera companies, etc.).

With the exception of the grant to the Brooklyn Children's Museum which was allocated totally for youth, grants of the Department of Cultural Affairs were allocated on the basis of the youth share of the population (26%). Administrative expenditures of the Department were allocated to youth in proportion to the youth share of grants for all institutions including the Brooklyn Children's Museum.

Q. Criminal Justice Coordinating Council

The Criminal Justice Coordinating Council is responsible for the planning and coordination of crime control and criminal justice activities in New York City. One of the Council's major activities is to award grants to various programs for prevention, diversion, rehabilitation, etc.

According to information supplied to the Mayor's Blue Ribbon Committee on Youth Services (assuming an even age distribution and making the appropriate adjustments for programs which served a population over 18), contractual services for youth represented 26.59% of total contracts. Administrative services were allocated

234

according to the same distribution.

R. Office of Model Cities

The Office of Model Cities provided a wide range of services, to three targeted areas - Harlem/East Harlem, South Bronx, and Central Brooklyn. These services, provided directly and through OTPS Purchase of Service Agreements, include health, counseling, education, employment, sanitation, and fire salvage programs. Expenditures for these services were allocated as follows:

1) Health/Mental Health, education, and employment programs which served youth were identified. If a program served the under 21 age cohort, expenditures were allocated to youth and non-youth assuming an even age distribution, (i.e., expenditures for youth = total expenditures X 18/21).
2) The remaining social service program expenditures were excluded.
3) Expenditures for sanitation and fire salvage were eventually allocated based on the youth share of population (26%). These expenditures were classified under Housing, as these services were considered to contribute to neighborhood/community improvement.
4) Administrative expenditures were allocated according to the distribution of total service expenditures (PS and OTPS).

S. Board of Higher Education

The Board of Higher Education administers the Hunter Elementary and High Schools along with its responsibility for the City University of New York. All other expenditures were excluded.

T. Law Department

The Law Department is basically an overhead agency representing the City in litigation. However, the Law Department also handles cases in Family Court, including Juvenile Deliquency Petitions, Paternity Cases, Persons in Need of Supervision (PINS), and Child Support. Hence, all expenditures for Family Court were allocated for youth. In addition, 11% of executive, administrative and appeals expenditures were allocated to youth services on the basis of the share of Family Court expenses to the total agency expenses.

U. District Attorney

For the District Attorney's offices in the 5 counties of the City of New York, youth expenditures were based on the proportion of 16-17 year olds arrests to total arrests within each county (see "New York State Uniform Crime Report Adult Arrests 16 and over by County, 1977") and the ratio of legal services for youth to administrative expenditures. With the exception of Richmond County, which did not receive an LEAA grant for prosecution of juvenile offenders, 100% of LEAA funds for these programs in each county were allocated for youth.

V. Department for the Aging

The Department for the Aging administers the Foster Grandparent Program. Essentially, senior citizens are paid for providing child-care and companionship to eligible children. All PS expenditures for this program were allocated to youth.

Executive Management funds were allocated according to the percent of the total program PS represented by the Foster Grandparents Program.

OTPS expenditures were not allocated to specific programs. The

$23,575,901 in purchase of service agreements were allocated to non-youth and the remaining OTPS was allocated in the same proportion as Executive Management.

Based on administrative and executive management expenditures approximately 1% of the Department of the Aging budget of $29,262,893 was allocated for child care expenditures for children under 18.

W. Human Rights Commission

The Commission is empowered to eliminate and prevent discrimination in employment, housing, places of public resort, etc. This is essentially an overhead function. However, the Commission also administers the Neighborhood Stabilization Program.

Based on data supplied by Human Rights Commission, 10% of the Neighborhood Stabilization Program was allocated for youth. To this amount was added 4.4% of administrative expenditures based on the distribution of personal service costs among overhead, direct youth services, and non-youth services.

X. Board of Correction

The expenditures for the Board of Correction were allocated to reflect the proportions of the total expenditures for the Department of Correction, 18.199% for youth and 81.801% for non-youth services (see above).

A-2. New York City Housing Authority

Expenditures are based on the New York City Housing Authority, Annual Fiscal Report, December 31, 1978. Total expenditures were $413,240,620. This total was divided among two programs and allocated as follows:

(a) Housing Authority Police - Total expenditures of $27,268,394 were allocated to youth based on arrest data for FY 1978 in the "Housing Police Statistics, Incident Report, All Projects, Annual Report, 12/78"; the New York State Division of Criminal Justice Services Form #1986; and the "New York State Division of Criminal Justice Services Uniform Crime Reporting, Monthly Offenses Known to the Police". Accordingly 32.6% of total police expenditures or $8,889,496 was allocated to youth.

(b) Housing Services - All other Housing Authority expenditures were allocated to youth based on the share of the tenant population under 18 (42.6%) as reported in the Housing Authority Tenant Population Censuses of January 1, 1978 and July 1, 1978. Accordingly $163,998,168 was allocated to youth.

B. State of New York

Expenditures for the State of New York are appropriated amounts for fiscal year 1978 as reported in the State of New York, Executive Budget for the Fiscal Year April 1, 1978 to March 31, 1979. Only expenditures for the State Purposes Fund were considered since expenditures from the Local Assistance Fund are reflected in local government expenditures.

Within the State Purposes Fund, twelve agencies were found to operate programs serving children and youth. The agencies and programs are listed in Table 1B-1, and the functional distribution of each agency's expenditures are presented in Table IB-2. The youth share of each agency and program was estimated in the following ways.

A. Office of Parks and Recreation.

Services for New York City children are provided through two state purposes lines - Park Operations and Recreation Services. According to regional workload data provided by the Office, attendance at New York City historic sites and parks represented just over 0.2% of attendance at parks statewide. Accordingly, this share of state purposes funds for Park Operations was allocated for New York City Youth. For Recreation Services, $427,004 was expended for the New York City region in FY 1977-1978. (Recreation Budget Summary, 1977-1978 Fiscal Year, New York State Parks and Recreation, Internal memo.) Based on the youth share of the New York City population, 26% of these funds were allocated for youth.

B. Department of Mental Hygiene

There are two offices within the Department of Mental Hygiene which include services for New York City youth. (a) For the Office

TABLE B-1

Expenditures by State of New York for Youth Services by Agency, FY 1978

Agency	Total Appropriation	N.Y.C. Youth Share	Youth Share as Percent of Total	Distribution of Youth Expenditures
Office of Parks and Recreation	$ 56,944,103	$ 226,828	.4	.3
Parks Operations	50,301,551	104,627	.2	.1
Recreation Services	1,906,753	122,201	6.4	.2
All Others	4,735,799	—	0	0
Office of Mental Health	436,318,800	13,156,365	3.0	18.4
Prevention and Care in Children & Youth	41,113,641	13,156,365	32.0	18.4
All Other	395,205,159	—	0	0
Office of Mental Retardation	254,613,107	17,300,329	6.8	24.3
Prevention and Care	242,147,562	17,300,329		24.3
All Other	12,465,545		0	0
Commission on Alcoholism and Substance Abuse	1,976,138	1,741,653	88.1	2.4
Department of Health	79,594,683	6,533,992	8.2	9.2
Office of Public Health	2,524,435	295,358	11.7	.4
Preventive Services	56,714,856	6,238,634	11.0	8.8
All Other	20,355,392	—	0	0
Education Department	56,532,000	2,428,016	4.3	3.4
State Schools for Blind & Deaf	3,468,000	1,040,400	30.0	1.5
Vocational Education	1,089,000	315,810	29.0	.4
Library Services	4,320.000	465,866	10.8	.6
Museum & Science Services	3,154,000	346,940	11.0	.5
Vocational Rehabilitation	13,651,000	259,000	1.9	.4
All Other	30,850,000	—	0	0
Department of Correctional Services	219,070,003	10,335,114	4.7	14.5
Supervision of Inmates	111,865,274	10,335,114	9.2	14.5
All Others	107,204,729	—	0	0
Judiciary	272,360,903	5,227,425	1.9	7.3
Courts of Original Jurisdiction	211,762,841	2,117,625	1.0	3.0
Professional Services to Indigent	9,946,511	3,109,800	31.3	4.3
All Other	50,651,551	—	0	0

(Continued)

(Continuation of TABLE 8-1)

Agency	Total Appropriation	N.Y.C. Youth Share	Youth Share as Percent of Total	Distribution of Youth Expenditures
Division of Probation	$ 1,331,849	$ 148,838	11.2	.2
Supervision of local services	376,804	148,838	39.5	.2
All Others	955,045	—	0	0
Division for Youth	32,979,957	10,045,665	30.4	14.1
Rehabilitation	28,513,631	9,485,930	33.3	13.3
Delinquency Prevention	1,465,092	556,735	38.0	.8
All Other	3,001,234	—	0	0
Department of Social Services	48,429,653	3,988,250	8.2	5.6
Supportive Services	7,424,145	3,988,250	53.7	5.6
All Other	41,005,508	—	0	0
Department of Labor	16,176,345	66,416	.4	.1
State Manpower Training	3,530,800	55,610	1.6	.1
Manpower Services	686,100	10,806	1.6	0
All Other	11,959,445	—	0	0
Department of Agriculture & Markets	15,994,602	140,000	.9	.2
Extension Services	5,258,542	140,000	2.7	.2
All Other	10,736,060	—	0	0
Subtotal - Agencies with Youth Service Programs	1,492,322,143	71,338,891		100.0
All Other Agencies	2,910,710,227			
Total - State Purposes Appropriations	$4,403,132,370	$71,338,891		

TABLE B-2

Functional Allocation of State Expenditures for Youth Services, FY 1978

Agency	Education	Employ/ Training	Health/ Mental Health	Income Assist/Housing	Justice	Nutrition	Recreation	Child Care	Total
Office of Parks and Recreation							$ 226,828		$ 226,828
Office of Mental Health			$13,156,365						13,156,365
Office of Mental Retardation			17,300,329						17,300,329
Commission on Alcoholism and Substance Abuse			1,741,653						1,741,653
Department of Health			6,533,992						6,533,992
Education Department	$2,428,016								2,428,016
Dept. of Correctional Services					$10,335,114				10,335,114
Judiciary					5,227,425				5,227,425
Division of Probation					148,838				148,838
Division for Youth					10,045,665				10,045,665
Dept. of Social Services							$ 3,988,250		3,988,250
Dept. of Labor		$ 66,416							66,416
Dept. of Agriculture and Markets							140,000		140,000
Total - Youth Budget	$2,428,016	$ 66,416	$38,732,339		$25,757,042		$ 4,355,078		$71,338,891

of Mental Health, 32% of state purposes appropriations for prevention and treatment of mental illness in children and youth were allocated for New York youth based on NYC youth admissions as a share of statewide youth admissions. (Admissions, Discharges of Resident Patients, State and Children's Psychiatric Centers, Children and Youth by Comparative Age Categories, FY 1978; Bureau of Statistical Analysis, October 16, 1979.) (b) For the Office of Mental Retardation and Developmental Disabilities, 7% of the funds for Mental Retardation and Developmental Disabilities were allocated for New York City youth based on the share of NYC youth of the total population in care. (Bureau of Statistical Analysis, New York State Department of Mental Health, New York City Children in State Developmental Centers; New York City Children in Family Care, New York City Children in Residental Treatment Centers, March, 1979; New York State Executive Budget. Estimates of DMH Census, March, 1979, p. 394.)

C. Commission on Alcoholism and Substance Abuse, Prevention and Education

For the Commission 88% of state purposes funds were allocated for New York City youth under 18 based on estimates prepared by the Commission on Alcoholism and Substance Abuse Prevention and Education.

D. Department of Health

Two programs within this department oversee or deliver services to New York City youth. (a) Local Public Health Management and Preventative Services, Research, and Development - According to data supplied by the Department of Health Budget Office, approximately 45% of local assistance funding for Local Public Health Management was allocated for New York City. Based on this data, the youth share of Local Public Health funding for New York City children was estimated at 11.7% (.45 X .26) of the total state purposes appropriation for local public health management. (b) Preventative Services include child health services, family planning, medical rehabilitation, communicable disease control, dental health, Roswell Park and Helen Hayes Institute. Caseload data was not available for these activities. Consequently, 11% of state purposes appropriations for Preventative Services was allocated for New York City youth based on their share of the total state population.

E. Education Department

Education Department expenditures for New York City youth were divided among five programs: the State Schools for the Blind and Deaf, Vocational Education, Occupational and Vocational Rehabilitation Operations, Library Services and Museum and Education Services.

For the New York State Schools for the Blind and the Deaf, 30% of state purposes appropriations were allocated for New York City youth based on the share of children enrolled in State Schools for the Blind and Deaf in 1977-1978 from New York City. (Information Center on Education, New York State Education Department.)

For Vocational Education, 29% of state purposes appropriations were allocated for New York City youth based on the share of statewide secondary occupational class enrollment from New York City. ("Occupational Education Data System, School Enrollment, 1977-1978," New York State Education Department.)

For Library Services and Museum and Science Services, 11% of state purposes appropriations were allocated for New York City children based on New York City's share of the New York State population under 18.

For Vocational Rehabilitation, approximately 2% of state purposes funds were allocated to New York City youth under 18. ("New York State Office of Vocational Rehabilitation, Payments to Individuals, October 1, 1977 to September 30, 1978", Bureau of Fiscal Services.)

F. Department of Correctional Services

For the Department of Corrections, estimates of expenditures for youth were based on reports on commitments by age and county of commitment prepared by the State of New York Department of Correctional Services. Of the 8,084 males committed during 1978, 8.6% were New York City 16-18 year olds. Of the females, 1.3% were New York City 16-18 year olds. Accordingly, 4.9% of state purposes funding for Corrections was allocated for New York City 16 and 17 year olds.

G. Judiciary

Judiciary expenditures for youth consist of two categories. For the Courts of Original Jurisdiction, approximately 14% of state purposes money was allocated for the Family Court, Criminal Court in New York City, Civil Court of the City of New York, and District Courts in New York City. Accordingly, it was estimated that approximately 7% of this amount (or .98% of the total) was allocated to youth based on the proportion of JD and PINS petitions filed in

1976. (The City of New York Budget as modified 1978; Family Court and Supplementary Petitions, OCA, Table 13, 1978 Crime Control Plan, DCJS, 1978.) For professional services, 100% of the funds identified as appropriated for law guardians in New York City and for the Legal Aid Society's Juvenile Rights Division in New York City were allocated for children. (Twenty-third Annual Report of the Judicial Conference and the Office of Court Administration, Table 85, Family Court, Law Guardian Programs, p. 170.)

H. Division of Probation

Appropriations for New York City youth from the Department of Probation were limited to the "supervision of local services" portion of the agency's budget. According to DCJS data, 22% of all juvenile delinquent and persons in need of supervision in 1976, were New York City children under 16. Similarly, 51% of all juvenile probation intake cases and 28% of all juvenile investigations consisted of New York City youth under 18. Combining these figures, the average share for New York City youth was 39%. Accordingly, 39% of State purposes for supervision of local probation services were allocated for New York City youth. (State of New York, Division of Probation, "Statistical Fact Sheet, Summary Report, Family Workload, 1977".)

I. Division for Youth

For the Division for Youth, expenditures for New York City children are distributed through two programs: rehabilitative services, and delinquency prevention and youth development. Based on data for admissions to residential facilities in 1977-1978, 33% of rehabilitation funds were allocated for New York City youth under 18. (New York State Division for Youth,"Statistics and Survey Units, SPSS Report on Population Billing File, 10/18/79.") Based on the proportion of New York State children under 18 who live in New York City, 38% of the funds for Delinquency Prevention and Youth Development were allocated for New York City children.

J. Department of Social Services

The Department of Social Services reaches New York City children through the Supportive Services program. According to the Comprehensive Annual Social Services Program Plan for New York State, 1977-1978, 79% of statewide funding was allocated for children's services. Two-thirds of this share or 53% of total appropriations for supportive services in New York State were allocated to New York City children.

K. Department of Labor

According to the Employment and Training Administration, 17.5% of state and local programs may be allocated for youth. Thus, 17.5% of New York State purposes appropriations for manpower training and services were allocated to youth. Of this amount, 9% of the total was allocated to New York City youth based on the city's share of the state's 16 to 19 year old population.

L. Department of Agriculture and Markets.

For the Department of Agriculture and Markets, all funds appropriated for 4-H Cooperative Extension Services in New York City were allocated for youth.

C. Federal Expenditures for Youth

Federal expenditures are from Community Services Administration, Geographic Distribution of Federal Funds in New York, Fiscal Year 1978. Only direct federal operations are considered since grants to state and local governments are counted as state or local expenditures.

The share of a program's expenditures allocated to youth is based on the share of federal program funds allocated to youth identified in Conservation of Human Resources, "The Changing Scale and Nature of Federal Expenditures for Youth," Working Paper #1 in a series for NIE Contract #400-78-0057. The reader is referred to that working paper and its appendix for an explanation of the basis for estimating youth shares of federal programs. The calculations for each program are summarized in Table IC-1.

TABLE C-1

Expenditures in New York City Under Federal Youth Programs

($ in thousands)

Programs	Total Outlays in New York City	Outlays for Youth in New York City
Child Care & Social Services Programs		
Child Welfare Research	$ 43	$ 43
Child Abuse & Neglect Prevention & Treatment	1,840	1,840
Foster Grandparents	-	-
Runaway Youth	-	-
Rehab. Services - Special Projects	3,692	495
Rehab. Research & Demonstration Projects	3,199	429
Rehab. Training	2,547	341
Developmental Disabilities - Special Projects	2,362	317
VISTA	1,048	325
Community Action	17,051	13,641
Youth Challenge	-	-
Native American Programs	115	58
Child Development & Headstart	22,243	6,451*
	54,140	23,940
Education Programs		
Emergency School Aid - Title VII	-	-
Ethnic Heritage	110	110
Handicapped Early Childhood Assistance	461	461
Voc Ed Improvement Project	-	-
Ed TV - Sesame St & Electric Co	2,693	2,693
Ed TV - Packaging & Field Testing	52	52
NIE	130	40
National Center for Ed Statistics	77	24
NEA - Artists in the Schools	460	460
NEA - Expansion Arts	50	3.5
NEA - Special Projects	1,688	118.5
Handicapped Innovative Programs - Deaf/Blind Centers	2,529	2,529
Innovative Programs - Severly Handicapped	122	122
	8,372	6,613

---

*Outlays for youth are estimated share less headstart pools reported in the Budget of City of New York. This adjustment was made to avoid double counting of headstart funds received by the city.

TABLE C-1, p.2

Programs	Total Outlays in New York City	Outlays for Youth in New York City
Employment Programs		
National OJT	$ 4,644	$ 789
Job Corps ETA	1,770	301
DOI Job Corps	908	154
	7,320	1,244
Health Programs		
Alcohol Demonstration	4,838	822
Drug Abuse Demo	1,092	186
Drug Abuse Education	322	55
Drug Abuse Comm. Service	6,293	1,070
Mental Health Centers	534	91
CDC Lead Based Paint	645	226
Federal Hospital Ins. Fund	914,987	458
Federal Suppl. Medical Ins.	394,628	1,184
Community Mental Health Ctrs.	21,140	11,711
Family Planning Projects	2,707	1,489
Home Health Services	168	92
Veterans Hospitalization	198,755	199
NIH Research & Demo for Mothers & Children	6,543	2,159
	1,552,652	19,742
Income Programs		
Refuge Assistance	61	19
Social Security Retirement Ins.	2,390,794	212,781
Federal Unemployment Ins. Benefits	15,346	522
Unemployment Ins. Benefits	11,076	377
Veterans Death Benefits	41,846	3,055
Sp. Benefits for Disabled Coal Miners	1,794	205
Social Security Disability Ins.	423,911	37,728
Social Security Survivors Ins.	689,629	61,377
SSI	310,867	13,367
VA Compensations to Dependents	1,625	119
Dependents Indemnity	23,147	--
Railroad Retirement Fund	57,948	1,739
Payments for Subsidized Housing	90,063	37,826
	4,058,107	369,115
Justice Programs		
Discretionary Grants	9,305	1,861
JJDP Special Emphasis	6,042	6,042
Concentration of Federal Efforts	181	181
	15,528	8,084

TABLE C-1, p.3

Programs	Total Outlays in New York City	Outlays for Youth in New York City
Nutrition Programs		
WIC	$ 20,191	$ 16,152
Food Stamps Bonus Coupons	270,903	146,559
Community Food & Nutrition	460	368
	291,554	163,079
Recreation Programs		
Management of Land & Resources	773	240
Operation of National Parks	743	230
Planning & Development NPS	44	13
NEA - Museum Programs	5,689	341
NEA - Music Programs	2,814	169
Theatre Programs	2,436	146
NEH - Museum & History Programs	1,223	73
NEH - Special Projects	264	16
Youth Grants	61	61
Smithsonian	467	145
	$ 14,514	$ 1,434

Appendix IV

Sources and Methods for Estimating Public Expenditures for Services to Children and Youth in Houston, Texas

A. Expenditures by Local Government

1. City of Houston
2. Harris County
3. Harris County Child Welfare Unit
4. Harris County Hospital District
5. Housing Authority of the City of Houston
6. Houston Independent School District
7. Spring Branch Independent School District
8. Other Independent School Districts
9. Mental Health and Mental Retardation Authority of Harris County

B. Texas State Direct Expenditures in Houston

C. Federal Outlays in Houston

A-1 City of Houston

Figures for City of Houston are expenditure figures from the City Controller, Annual Financial Report of the City of Houston, Texas for the fiscal year ended December 31, 1978.

Total expenditures for the City of Houston were $529,712,901. Of this total, $53,561,000 in debt service was excluded from the analysis. In addition, $67,358,370 was for agencies providing overhead functions and $228,817,604 was for agencies providing indirect services such as transportation and street cleaning. The remaining $179,975,927 was for nine agencies engaged in the direct provision of services to youth.

The following sections describe the allocation of funds within these nine agencies to youth services and the functional allocations of these youth service expenditures. The calculations are summarized in Tables A-1(a) and A-1(b).

A. CIVIC CENTER

The Civic Center Department is responsible for the operation, engineering, and maintenance of downtown City office buildings. The Department's Auditorium Division is responsible for management, rental, maintenance and operations of Sam Houston Coliseum, Music Hall, Jones Hall, Albert Thomas Convention Center and the City's parking garages. The Civic Center sponsors several youth specific programs including student concerts by the Houston Symphony, summer youth programs, student music and dance recitals and similar kinds of targeted programs.

TABLE A-1a

Expenditures for Youth Services by the City of Houston, FY 1978

	Total	Youth Share	Percent to Youth
Agencies Providing Direct Services	$179,975,927	$40,269,231	22.4
Civic Center	3,686,000	1,024,708	27.8
Cultural Arts Council	1,461,000	406,158	27.8
Health Dept.	20,463,630	10,755,655	52.6
Human Resources Dept.	2,467,785	1,837,815	74.5
Library Dept.	9,106,651	2,131,763	23.4
Mayor's Office - CETA	34,837,208	5,781,300	16.6
Mayor's Office - Community Development	4,658,000	2,293,585	49.2
Parks & Recreation Dept.	14,039,000	6,487,785	46.2
Police Dept.	89,256,653	9,550,462	10.7
Agencies Providing Indirect Services	228,817,604	63,611,294	27.8
Agencies Providing Overhead Services	67,358,370	18,725,627	27.8
Unallocated Items (debt service)	53,561,000	—	0
Grand Total	$529,712,901	$82,336,921	15.5

TABLE A-1b

Functional Allocation of Youth Service Expenditures, City of Houston, FY 1978

	Education	Employ/ Training	Health/ Mental Health	Income Assist/Housing	Justice	Nutrition	Recreation	Child Care/ Protection Services	Agency Total
Civic Center	$	$	$	$	$	$	$1,024,708	$	$ 1,024,708
Cultural Arts Council							406,158		406,158
Health Dept.			10,755,655						10,755,655
Human Resources	137,836				608,317			1,091,662	1,837,815
Library Dept.	2,131,763								2,131,763
Mayors Office – CETA	564,694	5,039,988					176,618		5,781,300
Mayor's Office - Comm. Develop.	50,510		511,092	312,211	274,477		116,911	1,028,384	2,293,585
Parks & Recreation Dept.					315,038		6,172,747		6,487,785
Police Dept.					9,550,462				9,550,462
TOTAL	$2,884,803	$5,039,988	$11,266,747	$312,211	$10,748,294	–	$7,897,142	$2,120,046	$40,269,231

An analysis of the bookings of events in the Civic Center buildings determined that youth specific programs plus general programs likely to be attended by larger numbers of youth than adults (rock concerts for example) closely approximated the youth proportion of the total population of Houston. Hence, the youth proportion of the total population of Houston, 27.8 percent, was used to allocate agency funds to youth programs. All expenditures by the Civic Center are allocated to "Recreation".

B. CULTURAL ARTS COUNCIL

The Cultural Arts Council of Houston provides financial support for a variety of artistic organizations, exhibits, and productions including the Houston Ballet, Houston Grand Opera, Houston Pops Orchestra, Society for the Performing Arts, Theatre Under the Stars, and a few museums. The broad range of the programs and activities supported by the CAC prohibits detailed research on the user population profile. In the absence of valid and reliable data to the contrary, it has been assumed that youth benefit in proportion to their representation in the population (27.8%).

C. HEALTH DEPARTMENT

The Health Department's programs are divided into five divisions: 1) Administration; 2) Technical (Program) Support; 3) Personal Health Services; 4) Environmental Pollution Control; and 5) Consumer Health Services. For purposes of allocation, the first two divisions were treated as administrative expenditures to be allocated on the basis of the proportion of youth expenditures determined from the last three. Environmental Pollution Control and Consumer Health Services (inspections, issuance of licenses, and veterinary services) were excluded from the analysis as not being a direct service to youth. Personal health services were allocated by specific programs to determine the proportion of youth served. The total number of cases or contacts for fourteen personal health programs were computed as shown below:

TOTAL CASES/CONTACTS = 439,662
TOTAL YOUTH CASES/CONTACTS = 299,734

Thus, approximately 70 percent of personal health services were considered to be for youth. If the youth share of the population (youth population) was then applied to the total expenditures for Environmental Pollution Control and Consumer Health Services and 70 percent to Personal Health programs, then it is estimated that youth received 56.6 percent of the department's administrative funds. This proportion was applied to the two administrative program divisions to calculate the total youth share.

D. HUMAN RESOURCES DEPARTMENT

The Model City Department was redesignated the Human Resources Department in 1976 to provide a variety of services aimed at improving the quality of life for all Houstonians. The Department's primary responsibilities include coordinating the delivery of human services within the city and ensuring that the service delivery system is adequate and addresses the needs of the community. The HRD contracts with other public and selected nonprofit agencies to provide direct services to youth, particularly child care, delinquency prevention and treatment, and education.

The percent of HRD expenditures allocated to youth (74.5%) was determined by an analysis of the budgets for all contracts for services during 1978. Revenue Sharing funds for architectural and engineering work on a multi-service center construction project were excluded. Federal Title XX funds generated from the CD Revenue Sharing funds were included since these funds did not pass through any other department or local government. Community Development Funds transferred to HRD to carry on model city projects, however, were excluded in analysis of HRD expenditures but are reflected in the Mayor's Office--Community Development Division expenditures.

Of the funds expended for youth, the following functional distribution was revealed by the contract analyses:

Function	Amount
Child Care	$1,091,662
Justice	$ 608,317
Education	$ 137,836
	$1,837,815

E. LIBRARY DEPARTMENT

The Houston Public Library System offers a broad program of educational, informational and recreational opportunities and cultural enrichment alternatives. These services are available through the Central

Library (500 McKinney), the Clayton Library (Center for Genealogical Research, 5300 Caroline), twenty-six branch libraries, four reading and study centers, three bookmobiles, the Children's Carousel and two outreach programs--Books-by-Mail and Institutional Services.

The Houston Public Library conducted a study of the 1978 expenditures for children as an International Year of the Child activity. A door count and telephone count survey revealed the following user profile.

	Number	Percent
Adult	3,808,532	76.59
Child	1,164,020	23.41
TOTAL	4,972,552	100.0

The total expenditures for 1978 were allocated to youth based upon the survey findings.

F. MAYOR'S OFFICE: CETA PROGRAMS DIVISION

The CETA Programs Division is responsible for U.S. Department of Labor funded manpower and training programs in the City of Houston, particularly administration of the Comprehensive Employment Training Act (CETA) programs. Youth activities can be carried out under several titles but Title III is specifically earmarked for youth programs.

The following proportions were used to determine percentage of youth expenditures in the respective titles of CETA. These data were furnished by CPD Central Records and represent the reported number of clients in the "youth" category.

Title	Percent Youth
I	10.3
II	6.0
VI	5.0

Since CETA records include percentages for participants ages eighteen and under, Titles II and VI were further reduced by 33 percent on the basis of CPD monitoring report data which revealed that about one-third of the participants eighteen and under would be eighteen years of age.

Youth specific programs, principally Title III and CSA funded programs, were allocated to youth as follows on the basis of data supplied by subcontractors:

Program	Percent for Youth
Mayor's Summer Youth Program	85.0
YETP	75.0
YSIS	95.0
YCCIP	25.0
CSA	100.0
	84.5

The youth specific expenditures are subdivided further by functional category as follows based on a review of the contracts.

Function	Amount
Employment & Training	$5,039,988
Education	$ 564,694
Recreation	$ 176,618
TOTAL	$5,781,300

G. MAYOR'S OFFICE: COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DIVISION

Community Development is a special block grant program through which the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) provides grants which the City allocates at its discretion for eligible activities. The program is capital intensive and focuses on physical environmental improvements in low income neighborhoods. Certain public services (principally social services) can be provided where they can be shown to be related to the physical environmental improvements being undertaken with grant funds. In addition, the recipient City has had the option to continue certain model city activities, which was done in Houston. The youth expenditures by Community Development in 1978 were for continuation of Model Cities programs and supportive public services.

Youth expenditures, as a portion of all CD expenditures, were estimated through analysis of each subcontract for services rendered during 1978 and a division of the services into adult and youth categories by project or within projects, where the project served both youth and non-youth. Administrative costs were distributed according to the proportion of youth services to total services. The result was an estimated $2,293,585 or 49.2% for youth services.

The distribution of youth expenditures by function is as follows:

Function	Amount
Education	$ 50,510
Health/Mental Health	511,092
Income Assistance/Housing	312,211
Justice	274,477
Recreation	116,911
Child Care/Protective Services	1,028,384
TOTAL	$2,293,585

H. PARKS AND RECREATION DEPARTMENT

The Parks and Recreation Department organizes and carries out a wide variety of recreation programs.

The Parks and Recreation Department, Facility Control Division provided the following financial and user data:

Program Activity	Total Expenditure	Percent Youth	Youth Expenditure
Park Police	$ 940,613	31.3	$ 646,201
Special Activities	387,476	20.0	309,981
Miller Theater	120,735	35.0	78,478
Facility Planning	103,889	31.3	71,372
Garden Center	37,905	10.0	34,114
Zoo	1,406,708	50.0	703,354
Facility Maintenance	6,655,890	31.3	4,572,596
Facility (Recreation) Operations	3,474,653	80.0	694,931
TOTAL	$13,127,869	46.2	$6,066,842

The expenditures for each of these program activities were allocated to youth according to these user patterns. The cumulative total revealed that about 46.2 percent of the Department's program activities benefit youth. Administrative costs were distributed accordingly to arrive at the total youth allocation ($6,487,785). All funds except those for Park Police (Justice) were allocated to recreation.

I. POLICE DEPARTMENT

The share of Police Department activity allocated to youth was estimated on the basis of offense reports. Of the total of 191,046 offense reports handled by the Police Department in 1978, 20,525 were reported by the Juvenile Division. Thus 10.7% of police activity and expenditures were allocated to direct youth services.

A-2 Harris County

Figures for Harris County are expenditures reported in County Auditor, Harris County, Texas and Harris County Flood Central District Comprehensive Annual Financial Report for the Year Ended December 31, 1978.

Within the structure of Harris County four types of agencies were found to provide services directly to children and youth. The method for estimating these expenditures are described in the four sections below.

A. ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE

The designation Administration of Justice is inclusive of District, Civil and Criminal Courts, and related law support personnel and agencies. It does not include Child Welfare or Juvenile Probation county agencies which are reported upon separately. Included are the Juvenile Courts, Family Law Courts, Probate Courts, County Courts, Civil and Criminal District Courts, court support personnel such as court reporters, bailiffs, court administrators, and certain other departments, services, or personnel where youth service relatedness can be demonstrated to some degree. The designation Administration of Justice, then, does not refer to an agency but to functions and personnel employed by several county agencies.

Table A-2 (a) lists the wide range of agencies and positions which are included in this service cluster in Harris County. To determine the totals for Houston, the county totals were reduced by the proportion of persons below the poverty line, who resided in the county, but outside the City of Houston. (Court-related activities as a whole, impact poverty persons more than non-poverty persons, particularly for juvenile justice matters.)

TABLE A-2

Expenditures for Administration of Justice in Harris County, FY 1978

Program	Total $	Percent Youth	Youth Expenditure $
Juvenile Courts - Office of Referee	104,882	100%	104,882
Family Court Services	554,631	See Text	148,225
Pre-trial Release	494,296	1	4,943
Attorneys (Court Appointed)	2,477,648	2	49,553
Constables	3,823,998	2	76,480
Legal Defense Services	49,650	2	993
Court Reporters	2,352,666	2	47,053
Court Coordinator District Courts	577,938	See Text	37,175
Judges, District Courts	1,110,934	See Text	71,460
Justice of Peace	2,160,491	2	43,210
Sheriff	5,574,559	2	111,491
First Court Civil Appeals	23,559	2	471
District Attorney	6,145,221	2	122,904
District Clerk	5,227,694	See Text	336,267
14th Court of Civil Appeals	25,037	2	501
Law Library	253,754	2	5,075
Jury Fund	935,016	2	18,700
Probate Court Judges	605,752	20	121,150
Civil Court Building	543,487	2.3	12,500
Family Law Center (Building)	563,080	See Text	142,910
District Attorney Building	304,241	2	6,085
Miscellaneous	30,136	2	603
Other (All non-youth)	1,052,056	2	0
TOTAL	$34,990,726		$1,462,631

District Courts expenditures are aggregated in the Annual Financial Report of the County. This fact, coupled with the lack of other data presented many problems in estimating costs that could be specifically attributed to youth services. Most often a figure of 2 percent was used based upon an analysis of the court dockets and assuming equal distribution in time between adult and child cases. Of 123,200 cases on the dockets for the eighteen divil district courts, at least 2,473 could be considered child cases (about 1450 adoptions plus 1023 juvenile court cases). Thus, the 2 percent figure is used. Pretrial release affects only about one percent since a juvenile must be certified as an adult to participate in this adult offender program. In some cases a two step procedure was needed to allocate costs. For example since the juvenile courts comprise 25 percent of courts generally hearing family and child cases (nine family plus three juvenile courts equal twelve total), this percent was applied to the expenditure item of Family Court Services. In addition, however, it was necessary to add 2.3 percent of cases (adoptions) which are also heard in the family court which are child focused. According to Probate Judge 20 percent of the probate cases concern children and youth under age eighteen.

Judges' expenditures in the District Courts were allocated according to the percent that the number of Juvenile Courts and Family Courts comprised of the total number of courts. Thus, Juvenile Courts comprised 6 percent of the total, Family Law Courts 18.8 percent, and 2.3 percent was allocated based on the rate of adoptions on the District Court dockets. The same procedure was followed in allocating costs for the District Clerk expenditures, and the Court Coordinators' expenditures.

In order to estimate building maintenance and operating costs to be assigned to the Civil Courts building, the 2.3 percent figure on adoptions was used because this is the location of the courts which hear adoptions and where most support personnel are housed. The Family Law Center houses the three probate courts, three juvenile courts, and nine family law courts and related personnel. A weighting of the proportion of youth cases for each court, as previously indicated, was used to determine the operational allocation.

B. CHARITIES: INSTITUTIONS AND CHILD CARE

Charities - Institutions is also a category in the Harris County Financial Report and not a Department. Child Care has been added to provide a more accurate description of the services included in the budget class. Included are Burnett-Bayland Home, Harris County Youth Village, and three county group homes. These group care facilities for youth, ages ten through seventeen years serve clients of the Juvenile Probation Department and certain youth under the custody of the Harris County Child Welfare unit. (Excluded are expenses which have been allocated to the Harris County Child Welfare Unit, Mental Health Mental Retardation Authority, and the Harris County Department of Social Services. These funds are included elsewhere in this study.)

The entire 1978 expenditure for Burnett-Bayland Home, Harris County Youth Village, and three group homes, as reported in the Annual Financial Report, inclusive of building engineer and related maintenance cost, was considered as spent for youth. This amount, $2,434,342 was multiplied by 82.2 percent, the proportion of Harris County children under eighteen years of age with poverty family incomes who live in Houston to estimate the Houston share of the county total or $2,001,029. The proportion of the child population of persons living in households below poverty was determined from U.S. Bureau of Census, 1970 Census of Population and Housing: Census Tracts, Houston, Texas, SMSA and adjacent area (May, 1972), p. 100, Table p. 4.

C. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

The Department of Education, also referred to as the Harris County Board of Education, receives tax funds through a specific levy on property by the Harris County Commissioners Court. The Department provides 1) teacher and counselor training; 2) curriculum development; 3) psychological services; and 4) attendance services. About 30 percent of the agency's activities are concerned with psychological testing, 10 percent with attendance services (mostly outside of Houston) and the balance distributed between curriculum development and staff development functions to enrich direct educational services. As the larger Independent School Districts in the County have developed internal capacity in these functions the Department has allocated more of its resources to the smaller districts to the point that as of 1978, an estimated 50 percent of the Department's services were provided outside of Houston. This 50 percent of the agency total was allocated to youth in Houston.

D. JUVENILE PROBATION DEPARTMENT

The Harris County Juvenile Probation Department (HCJPD) is the county agency charged with administration of the non-judicial aspects of the Texas Family Code concerned with juvenile delinquency and children in need of supervision. The Department provides direct services to children in the form of probation, placement, short-term detention, direct and purchased group care and foster care, and counseling and referral services. The agency supports the juvenile and family courts through home investigations and dispositional recommendations. The HCJPD is also charged with collection of child support payments ordered by the courts.

The total expenditure was $6,120,560 for the County. Of this amount an estimated 79 percent ($4,835,242) was allocated to Houston. The 79 percent figure was furnished by a staff planner at HCJPD and is based upon referrals to the department from various law enforcement agencies. The percent has been relatively constant for the last few years and is substantially in agreement with other indicators.

Amounts for each function were obtained from the Annual Financial Report and result in the following allocation:

Function	Amount	Percent
Health & Mental Health	$ 36,802	0.8
Income Assistance/Housing	772,193	16.0
Justice	2,357,156	48.7
Child Care/Protection	1,669,091	34.5
	$4,835,242	100.0

A-3 HARRIS COUNTY CHILD WELFARE UNIT

Harris County Child Welfare Unit (HCCWU) is legally a County agency with an independent Board of Directors. With few exceptions, however, its employees are state employees and under the supervision of the Regional Administrator of the Texas Department of Human Resources. The HCCWU Board can allocate local tax funds at their discretion, subject to budget approval of the Harris County Commissioners Court. Local tax funds can be used to match state and federal funds for programs or be used to supplement or add to the services available through state funds. A contract between TDHR and HCCWU governs the joint state-county sponsored services and defines authority and responsibilities.

The HCCWU provides the customary range of services for public child welfare agencies: 1) protective services; 2) child placement; 3) substitute care; 4) medical; 5) legal; and 6) transportation services. Incidental recreation and educational services are provided in addition.

The total 1978 expenditure reported by HCCWU was $3,489,276. (See Harris County Child Welfare Unit, Annual Financial Statement, 1978.) From this amount $529,385 in AFDC foster care payments were subtracted, since these are reflected as a TDHR Regional Office expenditure in this study. The resulting total was $2,959,891 for the County. The best indicator for determining the amount of funds used to serve youth in Houston is the proportion of County children under age eighteen with family incomes below the poverty level who reside in Houston, reported in the 1970 census as 82.2 percent. Accordingly $2,959,891 was estimated as spent on children in Houston.

To determine the functional allocation of expenditures, each service itemized in the agency financial report was classified by function. The resulting amount was subjected to the 82.2 percent City proportion as cited above. Overhead and administrative costs were distributed according to the percentages reported per functional category. Legal services were considered an administrative expense due to the absence of a more appropriate category. The resulting distribution is as follows:

Function	Amount	Percent
Education	$ 7,518	0.31
Health/Mental Health	288,268	11.85
Recreation	894	0.00
Child Care/Protective	2,136,350	87.80
TOTAL	$2,433,030	100.0

A-4

HARRIS COUNTY HOSPITAL DISTRICT

Harris County Hospital District provides a wide range of inpatient and outpatient health services through two large public hospitals and eight decentralized clinic facilities. The two hospitals are located in Houston and six of the eight clinics are in Houston. Eligibility for service is based on low-income family status so that the user profile reflects the distribution of the poverty population within the County.

For certain youth targeted services, separate financial data is reported in the Harris County Hospital District Budget, Fiscal Year Ending March 31, 1979. The youth specific programs are as follows:

Hospital	Program	1978 FY Expenditure
Jeff Davis	New Born Nursery	$ 2,288,000
Jeff Davis	Neonatology	781,000
Jeff Davis and Ben Taub	Outpatient Pediatric Clinics	914,000
Ben Taub	Pediatric Bed Allocation	1,675,000
Ben Taub	Pediatric ICU	624,000
Ben Taub	Other Child Specific Hospital Programs	1,825,000
–	Estimated Youth Expenditures in Neighborhood Clinics	4,091,000
	TOTAL	$12,198,000

These data on pediatric services include only persons fourteen years of age and under. To identify expenditures for services to persons 15-17 the proportion of the population represented by this age group (5.8% in 1970) was applied to total expenditures to estimate the additional share ($707,484) for persons aged 15-17. Thus, total youth expenditures were $12,198,000 plus $707,484, or $12,905,484.

The total amounts for youth within Houston was estimated based on the proportion of the county poverty population that resides in Houston (82.2%). Thus total youth expenditures in Houston are estimated at $10,608,308.

A-5 HOUSING AUTHORITY OF THE CITY OF HOUSTON

Description

The Housing Authority of the City of Houston (HACH) is charged with developing and administering standard housing for lower income individuals and families. There are three major programs operated by HACH: 1) HACH owned projects; 2) HACH leased projects; and 3) the Housing Assistance Payments Program (Section 8). Tenant services, including protective services, recreation, referral and counseling are provided to residents of multi-family facilities owned or leased by HACH as a part of programs (1) and (2) above. Housing assistance services are provided for persons who participate in the HAP Section 8 (number 3) program but not tenant services.

Total expenditures reported in HACH financial statements by program are:

Program	Total Amount	HUD Amount (Subsidy/Assistance)
LHA-Owned Rental Housing	$ 3,501,943	$1,358,782
LHA-Leased (S-9)	479,796	320,802
LHA-Leased (S-10)	592,747	408,769
Housing Assistance Program (S.8)	7,112,078	7,353,520
TOTAL	$11,686,564	$9,441,873

The amounts to be allocated to youth were estimated through assistance from HACH Division of Resident Services and Division of Protective Services who advised that 1) 75 percent of tenant services; 2) 15 percent of protective services; and 3) 60 percent of housing services were consumed by youth. The housing services estimate was determined by dividing the average number of children per unit (2.4) by the average number of persons per unit (4.0). When the total expenditures are allocated by use of these ratios it was found that 57.2 percent of Housing Project services benefited youth. Thus, 57.2 percent of the administrative costs for Housing projects were allocated to youth with the following results:

PROJECTS ONLY

Total Amount	Percent Youth	Youth Amount
$4,574,486	57.2	$2,618,479

HOUSING ASSISTANCE PAYMENTS PROGRAM

Total Amount	Percent Youth	Youth Amount
$7,112,078	60.0	$4,267,247

The youth specific services are allocated by function as follows:

Function	Amount	Percent
Income Assistance/Housing	$6,764,155	98.2
Justice	46,910	0.7
Recreation	74,661	1.1
TOTAL	$6,885,726	100.0

A-6 HOUSTON INDEPENDENT SCHOOL DISTRICT

According to the Houston Independent School District Annual Financial Report for the Fiscal Year ended August 31, 1978, the total expenditures of HSID for FY 1978 were $286,563,267. Of the total number of students in HSID approximately 5 percent reside in other municipalities. Thus, Houston youth are beneficiaries of 95 percent of the total youth expenditure. In addition the total number of persons over age seventeen (excluding persons in standard educational programs who have reached their eighteenth birthdate but who have not yet obtained the high school diploma) constitute about four-tenths of one percent (0.4%) of the total population served by HISD. This number includes non-youth in vocational programs, adult education, and certain special services. Thus, the total amount of funds spent on Houston youth was further reduced by .4 percent after the 5 percent reduction was made for non-residents of Houston. Finally, transportation expenditures totaling $8,166,107 were eliminated from the analysis.

The overhead expenditures of $53,484,037 were allocated according to the above percentage distributions for Houston youth and by function and are included in the allocation totals. CETA funds from the City of Houston in the amount of about $1.9 million were excluded, having already been counted in the expenditures of CETA.

The functional distribution of expenditures for youth allocations was estimated from analysis of the general fund, approximately forty (40) grants, and user profile data furnished by the District. The estimated functional distribution is:

Function	Amount
Education	$230,594,118
Health/Mental Health	3,548,792
Income Assistance/ Housing	16,362
Nutrition	26,623,500
Recreation	3,197,284
TOTAL	$262,980,056

A-7 SPRING BRANCH INDEPENDENT SCHOOL DISTRICT

According to its Annual Financial Report for the year ended August 31, 1978, the total SBISD expenditure for FY 1978 was $54,319,008 of which 99.5 percent was spent on youth, for a total of $54,047,413. Eighty-three percent (83%) of the SBISD pupils live in the City of Houston, thus a total of $44,859,354 was estimated to be public expenditure for Houston youth.

The percent distribution of expenditures by function was determined through analysis of the reported activities in the Financial Report. A total administrative overhead expenditure of $11,088,151 was distributed to the various functions on the basis of an analysis of the percentage distribution of direct educational services, as reported in the budget. Transportation services were excluded from the analysis. This yielded the following functional distribution:

Function	Amount
Education	$37,042,418
Health/Mental Health	366,780
Nutrition	3,620,091
Recreation	2,073,421
TOTAL	$43,102,710

A-8 OTHER INDEPENDENT SCHOOL DISTRICTS

There are sixteen (16) independent school districts which overlap the City of Houston's municipal boundaries. Approximately eighty-five percent (85%) of the Houston children attend either HISD or SBISD, for which specific data have already been furnished. Little justification could be found for reporting on each of the other fourteen districts separately since none of these are located in whole in Houston and most have a small proportion of their total pupil population in Houston. More error is likely to be present in determining the Houston student population for each of these "surburban" districts than in generalizing from HISD and SBISD total expenditures and distributions to the 15 percent of Houston students who attend the fourteen other districts.

Consequently expenditures for Houston residents among these fourteen other school districts was estimated as follows:

First, the total expenditures for Houston youth by HISD and SBISD were determined by adding the expenditures shown in the two preceeding sections. Second, fifteen percent (15%) of this total, or $47,400,828, was estimated to be spent by other school districts for their students residing in Houston. Third, the functional distribution for this sum estimated by calculating the mean percent for each functional category from HISD and SBISD. The rationale for this procedure is that the two districts represent the extremes in socioeconomic conditions of all ISD's in the City and expenditures by function are assumed to be about the midpoint between the two extremes. Moreover, since HISD was eligible for the kind of housing assistance grant reported under HISD, this functional category was excluded. The resulting distribution follows:

Function	PERCENT		
	HISD	SBISD	MEAN
Education	85.1	82.6	83.9
Health/Mental Health	1.3	0.8	1.0
Nutrition	9.4	8.0	8.7
Recreation	1.2	4.6	2.9
Transportation	3.0	3.9	3.5

Applying the mean percent figures to the previous total and excluding transportation expenditures produced this functional distribution:

Function	Amount
Education	$39,769,295
Health/Mental Health	474,003
Nutrition	4,123,877
Recreation	1,374,624
TOTAL	$45,741,799

A-9 MENTAL HEALTH MENTAL RETARDATION AUTHORITY OF HARRIS COUNTY

The Mental Health Mental Retardation Authority (MHMRA) of Harris County provides county-wide planning, administration, direct services, and contracting for mental health and mental retardation services. The agency directly provides inpatient, outpatient, day-treatment (or training), recreation, diagnostic and referral services for mentally ill and mentally retarded persons in Houston and Harris County.

The 1978 Annual Report to the Taxpayers by MH-MRA reported total expenditures of $11,161,611. This amount has reduced by $1,026,439 to exclude $452,876 TDHR Title XX Funds and $573,563 CETA funds, counted elsewhere, for a net expenditure of $10,135,172.

The allocation for youth on a county-wide basis was estimated based on analysis of the age distribution of clients served as reported in the 1978 Annual Report. Accordingly 25.5 percent of the clients were estimated to be under age 18.

Since net expenditures were $10,135,172, the youth total was estimated as 25.5 percent of this amount or $2,584,469.

The percent of the Harris County population living in poverty who reside in Houston (82.2%) was used to estimate the share of the youth expenditures by MHMRA within the City of Houston. Accordingly youth expenditures in Houston were estimated at $2,124,434.

The functional distribution of expenditures was estimated based on an analysis of 1978 expenditures for all projects. Most services were classified as health or mental health; however, MHMRA had five contracts to purchase 24-hour care from group homes, which was considered child care rather than mental health services, and one project for the mentally retarded was considered to be more recreation than any other function. The resulting distribution is:

Function	Amount	Percent
Health/Mental Health	$1,871,626	88.1
Recreation	101,973	4.8
Child Care/Protective	150,835	7.1
	$2,124,434	100.0

B State of Texas

Expenditures for state agencies are based on the Texas Legislative Budget Board's Legislative Budget Estimates for the 1980-81 Biennium. This document reports actual expenditures by agency for the fiscal year September 1977 to August 1978. The only exception is the Department of Human Resources for which expenditures are for the same fiscal year but are based on data supplied directly by the Houston Regional Office of the Department.

Fifteen (15) state agencies were found to provide services directly to youth in Houston. The general approach followed for estimating state expenditures for services in Houston was to use agency statistics to estimate expenditures for youth within Harris County and then allocate a share of these expenditures to Houston based on the City's share of either total persons under 18 in the county (69.5%) or total persons under 18 with low incomes in the county (82.2%).

A more detailed explanation of the estimates for each agency follows. Table II B-1 summarizes the estimates of youth expenditures by agency and Table II B-2 shows the functional distribution of youth expenditures.

1 Department of Human Resources

The services provided directly by divisions of the regional office, through Harris County Child Welfare Unit or contracted through local government, are: A) AFDC; B) AFDC-Medicaid; C) child support; D) child welfare; E) day care; F) EPSDT; G) Indochinese program; H) non-emergency health transportation; I) vendor drug program; and J) food stamps. Since the food stamp program is included as a direct federal program (see

Section II-C) it has been excluded from this analysis. The youth share estimates for the remaining programs are described below.

A) AFDC - Total expenditures for Harris County were $18,196,906. Based on characteristics of the caseload it was estimated that 80% of this total, or $14,543,925 supported persons under 18. It was further estimated that 82.2% of this total, or $11,955,106 was spent on youth in the City of Houston based on the city's share of all low income youth in the county.

B) Medicaid - Total expenditures for Harris County are $14,258,547. Based on national figures for the distribution of medicaid expenditures by age (see R. Gibson, M.S. Mueller and Charles Fisher, "Age Differences in Health Care Spending, Fiscal Year 1976," Social Security Bulletin, (August, 1977) Vol.40, N. 8, p. 6) it was estimated that 17.2% of the total or $2,452,470 was spent on youth. Of this amount 82.2% or $2,015,930 was estimated to be spent on youth in the City of Houston.

C) Child Support - Total expenditures were $147,229 all of which were for youth. Of the county total 82.2% or $121,022 was estimated to be spent in Houston.

D) Child Welfare - Of the total county expenditures of $5,382,515 an estimated 82.2% or $4,424,427 was spent for youth in Houston.

E) Day Care - Of the total expenditures of $5,084,164 an estimated 82.2% or $4,179,183 was spent for youth in Houston.

F) EPSDT - Of the total of $752,605 an estimated 82.2% or $618,641 was spent on youth in Houston.

G) Indochinese Refugees - Total expenditures for Harris County were $74,610. Based on caseload data 67.7% of this total or $50,511 was estimated to be spent on persons under age 18. All these persons were reported to be living in Houston.

H) Health Transportation - Total expenditures for Harris County were $21,441. The proportion of youth was estimated at 7% or $1,501 based on the share of youth in the vendor drug program which has similar eligibility requirements (see below). Of this amount 82.2% or $1,234 was estimated to be spent on youth in the City of Houston.

I) Vendor Drug Program - Total expenditures in the county were $8,850,000. Based on statewide caseload figures it was estimated that 7% of this total or $619,500 was spent for persons under 18. Of this amount 82.2% or $509,229 was estimated to be spent on youth in Houston.

2 Commission for the Blind

The CB provides services directly through three programs--vocational rehabilitation, visually handicapped and cooperative school program. For each program funds were allocated to Harris County based on service statistics provided by the agency. Then 69.5% of the estimated expenditures for Harris County were estimated to be for Houston youth based on the share of persons under 18 in Harris County residing in Houston.

3 Commission for the Deaf

The CD provides services directly to children in Houston only through its interpreter services program. Only $107 was spent in Houston under this program.

4 Department of Health

Expenditures for Houston children were found in two programs: crippled children and kidney care. For crippled children services, the share of expenditures for Houston youth was based on the share of Harris County children to all children served multiplied by the percent of Houston children living in Harris County. Accordingly, 67% of total expenditures for health for Houston children were allocated for crippled children's services. Similarly, the share for kidney health care was based on the proportion of Harris County children to all clients statewide multiplied by the share of Houston children living in Harris County. Accordingly, .02% of state health expenditures for Houston youth were allocated to Kidney Health Care.

5 Department of Mental Health and Mental Retardation

Expenditures for direct services were divided among four programs: State Hospitals, State Schools, Human Development Centers, and Trims. For each of the programs, the share of Harris County children was calculated on the basis of the proportion of Harris County children of all clients in each facility. Of these expenditures, 69.5% were allocated to Houston on the basis of the number of Houston children living in Harris County.

6 Texas Rehabilitation Commission

The TRC provides direct services to youth through its vocational rehabilitation program and 14.3% of these expenditures were allocated to the Houston Regional Office. Of this sum, 30% was allocated for youth based on the share of the caseload under age 18. Of this total, 69.5%

was allocated to Houston youth based on the Houston proportion persons under 18 in Harris County residing in Houston.

7 Texas Agricultural Extension Services

Expenditures for Houston youth were divided between two programs: 4-H and Family Living. For 4-H, 10.7% of total expenditures were allocated to Harris County based on service statistics for Family Living, 5.9% of expenditures were allocated to Harris County based on caseload figures. Of these expenditures, 69.5% were allocated to Houston based on the Houston share of Harris county children under 18.

8 Texas Youth Council

The Texas Youth Council administers the state correctional facilities for delinquent children and specific delinquency prevention and diversion programs. Funds are divided among seven programs--training schools, training camps, state homes, contract residential care, community assistance, halfway houses, and parole. For each program agency service statistics were used to estimate the share of funds spent on youth in Harris County. Of these sums, 69.5% were allocated to Houston youth based on their share of the Harris County population under 18.

9 Texas Department of Community Affairs

Four programs of the DCA were found to provide services directly to Houston youth--drug prevention contract services, drug abuse programs, youth employment, and early childhood. For drug prevention contracts a total of $47,851 was identified as spent in Harris County and 69.5% of

13 Texas School for Deaf and Blind

An estimated 6.87% of total expenditures was allocated to Harris County children based on their share of the schools population. Of this total, 69.5% was allocated to Houston children based on their share of Harris County youth.

14 University of Texas Medical Branch at Galveston

This unit of the state university system operates John Sealy Hospital, Galveston State Psychopathic Hospital, Moody State School for Cerebral Palsied children, Ziegler Memorial Hospital, and the Children's Health Care Center. Each of these institutions accepts referrals on a statewide basis. Of the total budget $29,617,478 was identified for provision of clinical services at those institutions. Of this sum, 5.9% was estimated to be spent for Harris County youth and 69.5% of Harris County youth were estimated to be in Houston. The resulting estimate of expenditures for Houston youth is $1,214,465.

15 University of Texas Cancer System

Research and education expenditures were excluded to yield an estimate of statewide patient service expenditures. Of this sum 4.1% or $1,267,689 to Houston youth based on their share of the state population.

this sum or $33,256 was allocated to Houston youth. In the three other programs funds were allocated to Houston youth in proportion to their share of the state population under 18 as follows: early childhood - $63,494; youth employment - $13,838; and drug abuse - $15,883.

10 Texas Department of Corrections

Of the total of 24,659 inmates it is reported that 28 or 0.114% are residents of Harris County under age 18. This fraction was applied to total agency expenditures for correctional services of $60,634,822 to estimate youth expenditures in Harris County of $68,850. Of this sum 82.2% or $56,595 was estimated for Houston youth based on their share of the county's low income youth population.

11 Governor's Office: Criminal Justice Division.

In this office one contract for child care services was signed for services in Harris County totally $15,477. Of this sum 82.2% or $12,722 was allocated to Houston youth based on their share of the county poverty population.

12 Texas Education Department

Direct Services were funded by this agency through its Region IV Education Service Center. Of the funds for this program 40% were allocated to Houston youth based on the Houston and Spring Branch school district attendance as a share of attendance in all school districts in the region.

289

TABLE B-1

Expenditures by State Agencies for Youth Services in Houston Fiscal Year 1978

Agency	Total Expenditures	Houston Youth Share
Department of Human Resources*	$ 52,768,017	$23,875,283
AFDC	18,196,906	11,955,106
Medicaid	14,258,547	2,015,930
Child Support	147,229	121,022
Child Welfare	5,382,515	4,424,427
Daycare	5,084,164	4,179,183
EPSDT	752,605	618,641
Indochinese Program	74,610	50,511
Non-emergency Health Transportation	21,441	1,234
Vendor Drug Program	8,850,000	509,229
Commission for the Blind	3,033,034	28,912
Commission for the Deaf	182,170	107
Department of Health	53,707,205	798,956
Department of Mental Health and Mental Retardation	333,264,606	3,859,220
Texas Rehabilitation Commission	10,500,944	271,323
Agricultural Extension Services	16,025,811	433,333
Texas Youth Council	29,014,394	2,678,323
Department of Community Affairs	2,928,338	126,471
Department of Corrections	75,910,311	56,595
Criminal Justice Division	5,190,513	12,722

---

*Figures are totals for Harris County only and exclude Food Stamp program.

(TABLE . B-1 Cont.)

Agency	Total Expenditures	Houston Youth Share
Texas Education Department	$2,133,563,480	$ 861,402
Texas Schools for Deaf and Blind	8,661,290	340,336
University of Texas Medical Branch at Galveston	65,136,223	1,214,465
University of Texas Cancer System	45,577,724	1,267,689
TOTAL	$ NA	$35,825,137

TABLE 8-2

Functional Distribution of State Expenditures for Direct Services to Youth, FY 1978

	Education	Health & Mental Health	Finance & Housing	Justice	Nutrition	Recreation	Child Care & Protection	Employment	TOTAL
Dept. of Human Resources	$ –	$ 3,145,034	$12,126,639	$ –	$ –	$ –	$8,603,610	$	$23,875,283
Commission for Blind	28,912								28,912
Commission for Deaf	107								107
Dept. of Health		798,956							798,956
Dept. of Mental Health		3,859,220							3,859,220
Texas Rehabilitation Commission	271,323								271,323
Agricultural Extension Service	433,333								433,333
Texas Youth Council				2,678,323					2,678,323
Dept. of Comm. Affairs		49,139					63,494	13,838	126,471
Dept. of Corrections				56,595					56,595
Criminal Justice Division							12,722		12,722
Texas Education Dept.	861,402								861,402
Texas Schools for Deaf & Blind	340,336								340,336
Univ. Texas at Galveston		1,214,465							1,214,465
Univ. Texas Cancer System		1,267,689							1,267,689
TOTAL	$1,935,413	$10,334,503	$12,126,639	$2,734,915	$ –	$ –	$8,679,826	$13,838	$35,825,137

C. Federal Expenditures for Youth

Federal expenditures are from Community Services Administration, Geographic Distribution of Federal Funds in New York, Fiscal Year 1978. Only direct federal operations are considered since grants to state and local governments are counted as state or local expenditures.

The share of a program's expenditures allocated to youth is based on the share of federal program funds allocated to youth identified in Conservation of Human Resources, "The Changing Scale and Nature of Federal Expenditures for Youth," Working Paper #1 in a series for NIE Contract #400-78-0057. The reader is referred to that working paper and its appendix for an explanation of the basis for estimating youth shares of federal programs. The calculations for each program are summarized in Table II C-1.

TABLE C-1

Expenditures in Houston
Under Federal Youth Programs

($ in thousands)

Programs	Total Outlays in Houston	Outlays for Youth in Houston
Child Care & Social Services Programs		
Child Welfare Research	$ 120	$ 120
Child Abuse & Neglect Prevention & Treatment	-	-
Foster Grandparents	187	90
Runaway Youth	125	125
Rehab. Services - Special Projects	350	47
Rehab. Research & Demonstration Projects	3,260	437
Rehab. Training	-	-
Developmental Disabilities - Special Projects	-	-
VISTA	31	10
Community Action	4,028	3,224
Youth Challenge	-	-
Native American Programs	-	-
Child Development & Headstart	3,612	3,612
	11,713	7,665
Education Programs		
Emergency School Aid - Title VII	-	-
Ethnic Heritage	44	44
Handicapped Early Childhood Assistance	70	70
Voc Ed Improvement Project	-	-
Ed TV - Sesame St & Electric Co	-	-
Ed TV - Packaging & Field Testing	-	-
NIE	-	-
National Center for Ed Statistics	-	-
NEA - Artists in the Schools	-	-
NEA - Expansion Arts	1,680	118
NEA - Special Projects	-	-
Handicapped Innovative Programs - Deaf/Blind Centers	-	-
Innovative Programs - Severely Handicapped	-	-
	1,794	232
Employment Programs	-	-

TABLE C-1, p. 2

Programs	Total Outlays in Houston	Outlays for Youth in Houston
Health Programs		
Alcohol Demonstration	$ 393	$ 67
Drug Abuse Demo	242	41
Mental Health Centers	-	-
CDC Lead Based Paint	140	49
Federal Hospital Ins. Fund	57,245*	29
Federal Suppl. Medical Ins.	25,003*	75
Community Mental Health Ctrs.	911	501
Family Planning Projects	635	349
Home Health Services	82	45
Veterans Hospitalization	64,599	65
NIH Research & Demo for Mothers & Children	743	245
	149,993	1,466
Income Programs		
Refuge Assistance	-	-
Social Security Retirement Ins.	203,803	18,138
Federal Unemployment Ins. Benefits	1,757*	60
Unemployment Ins. Benefits	479*	16
Veterans Death Benefits	8,873	648
Sp. Benefits for Disabled Coal Miners	170	19
Social Security Disability Ins.	44,615	3,971
Social Security Survivors Ins.	103,256	9,190
SSI	29,911	1,286
VA Compensations to Dependents	645	47
Dependents Indemnity	9,188	-
Railroad Retirement Fund	25,743	772
Payments for Subsidized Housing	3,517	1,477
	431,957	35,624
Justice Programs		
Discretionary Grants	1,288	258
JJDP Special Emphasis	-	-
Concentration of Federal Efforts	120	185
	1,408	443

---

*Total outlays reported only for Harris County. The City of Houston share estimated as 71% of Harris County total based on estimated proportion of Harris County population residing in the City of Houston in 1978. See Houston Chamber of Commerce, "Houston Area Population 1960-1990," February 1979.

TABLE C-1, p. 3

Programs	Total Outlays in Houston	Outlays for Youth in Houston
Nutrition Programs		
WIC	$ 1,700	$ 1,360
Food Stamps Bonus Coupons	24,446	13,225
Community Food & Nutrition	-	-
	26,146	14,585
Recreation Programs		
Management of Land & Resources	48	15
Operation of National Parks	-	-
Planning & Development NPS	-	-
NEA - Museum Programs	40	2
NEA - Music Programs	709	43
Theatre Programs	99	6
NEH - Museum & History Programs	-	-
NEH - Special Projects	48	3
Youth Grants	-	-
Smithsonian	-	-
	$ 944	$ 69

Appendix V

Data Sources and Methodology for Study of Equity in the Distribution of Federal Funds

Calculations reported in this working paper required three types of data - expenditures for youth services under the eight major programs by state; youth beneficiaries under the eight major programs by state; and population data for the number of children and poor children by state. Since the source and character of the population data are described in the body of the paper, this Appendix describes only the sources of the expenditure and beneficiary data.

OASDI Program

Expenditures and beneficiary data by state are from U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Social Security Administration, Office of Policy, Office of Research and Statistics, Social Security Bulletin, Annual Statistical Supplement, 1976, Table 119, "Benefits in Current Payment Status: Number of Monthly Benefits by Type of Beneficiary and by State, at End of 1976," p. 161; Table 120, "Benefits in Current Payment Status: Amount of Monthly Benefits by Type of Beneficiary and by State, at End of 1976," p.162; Table 124, "Benefits in Current Payment Status for Children: Number by Type of Child Beneficiary and by State, at End of 1976," p. 166.

AFDC Program

Expenditure and beneficiary data are from U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Social Security Administration, Office of Policy, Office of Research and Statistics, Social Security Bulletin, Annual Statistical Supplement, 1976, Table 172, "Aid to Families with Dependent Children and Emergency Assistance: Average Monthly Number of Families and Recipients of Cash Payments and Total Amount of Payments, by State, 1976," p. 204.

Medicaid Program

Expenditure data are from U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Social and Rehabilitation Service, Office of Information Systems, National Center for Social Services, Medicaid Statistics, March 1977, Table 4, "Amounts of Medical Vendor Payments by Basis of Eligibility of Recipients and by HEW Region and State, Fiscal Year 1976," pp. 18, 19. Total Medicaid outlays for children is the sum of medical vendor payments for children (Table 4, p. 18) and medical vendor payments for other Title XIX recipients under 21 (Table 4, p. 19).

Beneficiary data are from U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Health Care Financing Administration, Office of Policy, Planning and Research, Office of Research, Medicaid State Tables, Fiscal Year 1976, Table 2, "Recipients by Basis of Eligibility and by State, Fiscal Year 1976," p. 8. Total Medicaid enrollment for children is from Table 2, p. 8, "Dependent Children Under 21." Expenditures per beneficiary were computed by dividing total outlays for children by total enrollment.

Vocational Education Program

Expenditure and beneficiary data are from U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Office of Education, Bureau of Occupational and Adult Education, Office of Adult, Vocational, Technical and Manpower Education, Division of Vocational and Technical Information, "Total Expenditures for Vocational Education by Level of Education, All Programs in 1976," p. 17, and "Total Enrollment in Vocational Education in the U.S. and Outlying Areas, Fiscal Year 1976," p. 25. Appropriate expenditure and beneficiary figures were estimated based on the ratio of the federal share of dollars for secondary vocational education programs and the share of total secondary enrollment in vocational education programs as reported in Vocational and Technical Education, pp. 17, 25.

Headstart Program

Expenditures by state are from Community Services Administration, Federal Outlays, Fiscal Year 1976, (Washington D.C., Community Services Administration, undated). Beneficiary data are from unpublished tabulations prepared by the U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, and titled "Summary of Headstart Enrollment, Fiscal Year 1976." Figures are for full-year enrollment at Headstart, and Parent and Child centers.

School Lunch Program

Expenditure data by state are from Community Services Administration, Federal Outlays, Fiscal Year 1976, (Washington D.C., Community Services Administration, undated.

Beneficiary data are from the unpublished report National School Lunch Program, Fiscal Year 1976, prepared by U.S. Department of Agriculture, Budget Division, Program Reports and Analysis. Beneficiary figures are averages of nine monthly reports of beneficiaries by state.

Food Stamp Program

Expenditures by state are based upon outlays reported in Community Services Administration, Federal Outlays, Fiscal Year 1976 (Washington, D.C.: Community Services Administration, undated). The state totals were adjusted to reflect only the share of expenditures accounted for by children and youth. The adjustment was based on regional proportions of beneficiaries who were under 18 as reported in U.S. Department of Agriculture, Food and Nutrition Service, Survey of Characteristics of Food Stamp Households, September 1977, p. 63, 70.

Youth beneficiaries are based on total beneficiaries as reported in U.S. Department of Agriculture, Food and Nutrition Service, Food Stamp Program, Statistical Summary of Operations, December 1975. The total number of beneficiaries was adjusted to reflect only youth beneficiaries based on the regional proportions of beneficiaries under 18 as reported in the Survey of Characteristics of Food Stamp Households, op. cit.

ESEA - Title I Program

Expenditure and beneficiary data are from unpublished tabulations for fiscal year 1976, prepared by the Office of Education, U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Appendix VI

Measures of Equity for Eight Programs by State

Table 1

Equity in the AFDC Program

FY 1976

	Children Served as a Percent of Residents under 18	Children Served as a Percent of Poor Children	Expenditure per Resident under 18	Expenditure per Poor Resident under 18	Expenditure per Child Served
All States	12.1%	82%	$12.86	$86.73	$106.16
Alabama	10.8%	59%	$4.81	$26.16	$44.50
Alaska	6.1	78	8.69	111.34	142.80
Arizona	6.2	33	3.61	19.31	58.18
Arkansas	11.9	53	6.30	27.85	52.90
California	15.8	108	20.70	141.35	130.76
Colorado	8.4	75	8.19	73.12	97.80
Connecticut	10.8	112	12.74	132.93	118.41
Delaware	12.3	117	11.27	107.44	91.87
D.C.	37.6	221	39.56	232.43	105.30
Florida	7.7	84	4.29	46.63	55.81
Georgia	13.0%	58%	$5.32	$23.80	$41.10
Hawaii	13.5	128	21.09	199.52	155.88
Idaho	5.0	43	5.93	50.17	119.61
Illinois	16.7	104	18.22	113.51	108.96
Indiana	7.6	77	4.26	58.74	76.66
Iowa	7.3	87	8.95	107.39	122.83
Kansas	8.5	93	9.12	99.11	106.78
Kentucky	13.5	63	10.81	50.72	80.38
Louisiana	13.4	56	6.36	26.56	47.43
Maine	13.5	87	11.61	71.35	82.41
Maryland	12.0%	111%	9.94	$91.92	$83.03
Massachusetts	14.8	137	20.39	189.14	137.78
Michigan	16.2	130	26.70	166.22	128.07
Minnesota	7.3	75	9.47	96.64	130.45
Mississippi	17.6	54	3.27	9.98	18.65
Missouri	14.2	94	9.00	59.58	63.38
Montana	5.6	42	4.63	34.36	82.65
Nebraska	5.3	51	4.94	47.18	93.26
Nevada	5.5	48	4.26	36.66	76.95
New Hampshire	7.1	67	7.44	70.33	105.10
New Jersey	14.6%	117%	$16.78	$134.29	$115.17
New Mexico	10.6	41	6.63	25.36	62.83
New York	16.8	122	28.46	206.65	169.08
North Carolina	8.8	48	6.62	36.23	75.34
North Dakota	4.9	41	5.45	46.15	112.18
Ohio	12.0	91	11.19	84.99	93.69
Oklahoma	8.4	52	7.01	43.96	83.78
Oregon	11.5	118	15.08	154.92	131.42
Pennsylvania	12.9	97	16.62	125.04	128.90
Rhode Island	14.1	125	17.21	152.65	152.65
South Carolina	11.2%	47%	$4.26	$17.82	$17.82
South Dakota	8.5	60	7.80	53.90	53.90
Tennessee	12.1	60	5.68	27.79	27.79
Texas	6.3	31	2.71	13.22	13.22
Utah	5.6	62	6.45	71.18	71.18
Vermont	10.7	59	12.70	69.17	69.17
Virginia	8.6	63	7.74	56.24	56.24
Washington	8.9	82	11.58	107.08	107.08
West Virginia	9.1	45	7.41	36.77	36.77
Wisconsin	9.4	91	13.48	129.86	129.86
Wyoming	4.0	44	3.75	40.91	40.91

Table 2

Equity in the Old Age, Survivors and Disability Insurance (Social Security) Program

FY 1976

	Children Served as a Percent of Residents under 18	Children Served as a Percent of Poor Children	Expenditure per Resident under 18	Expenditure per Poor Resident under 18	Expenditure per Child Served
All States	**5.6%**	**38%**	**$13.69**	**$89.65**	**$231.66**
Alabama	8.1%	44%	$16.94	$92.00	$208.51
Alaska	4.3	55	10.61	135.92	245.00
Arizona	5.9	32	14.29	76.39	241.16
Arkansas	8.8	39	16.20	80.36	205.67
California	5.1	35	12.54	85.65	244.30
Colorado	4.4	39	11.12	99.61	252.30
Connecticut	4.1	43	10.32	107.68	250.11
Delaware	5.4	51	13.72	130.75	255.11
D.C.	6.1	36	12.22	71.80	200.44
Florida	6.4	69	15.84	172.12	247.18
Georgia	7.4%	33%	$15.96	$104.22	$216.99
Hawaii	5.7	53	13.17	124.94	231.44
Idaho	5.0	42	12.68	107.28	255.78
Illinois	4.9	30	16.46	102.53	337.53
Indiana	5.3	53	14.22	142.89	268.43
Iowa	4.2	50	10.18	122.09	242.41
Kansas	4.6	50	11.00	119.60	241.18
Kentucky	7.8	37	17.34	81.3[illegible]	221.63
Louisiana	7.7	32	16.19	67.54	208.67
Maine	6.0	38	13.63	[illegible]7.15	227.96
Maryland	4.5%	42%	$11.18	$10[illegible].35	$248.05
Massachusetts	4.4	41	10.34	95.96	235.54
Michigan	5.4	43	14.27	114.59	264.05
Minnesota	4.0	41	9.13	93.19	228.15
Mississippi	9.2	28	16.49	50.31	176.78
Missouri	6.3	42	15.01	99.28	238.73
Montana	5.5	40	13.35	98.94	241.50
Nebraska	4.2	40	9.60	91.60	231.28
Nevada	5.6	47	15.96	137.13	286.51
New Hampshire	4.7	49	12.04	113.74	257.76
New Jersey	4.7%	37%	11.95	$95.64	$252.38
New Mexico	7.3	29	15.77	60.36	211.11
New York	5.1	37	12.35	89.66	241.22
North Carolina	7.0	38	14.92	81.67	213.04
North Dakota	4.4	37	9.04	76.51	204.09
Ohio	5.1	40	13.07	99.26	255.15
Oklahoma	6.4	40	14.87	93.21	233.70
Oregon	5.2	53	13.72	141.00	263.57
Pennsylvania	5.1	38	12.80	96.31	252.39
Rhode Island	4.9	44	11.68	103.57	237.13
South Carolina	7.4%	31%	$15.51	$64.79	$208.69
South Dakota	5.0	34	10.39	71.75	209.50
Tennessee	7.4	36	16.32	79.77	220.53
Texas	5.8	28	12.72	61.85	218.43
Utah	3.6	39	9.29	101.54	255.79
Vermont	5.4	29	12.83	69.90	238.45
Virginia	5.8	42	12.83	93.20	222.61
Washington	4.8	44	12.35	114.18	258.20
West Virginia	9.8	48	23.55	116.88	240.50
Wisconsin	4.6	45	11.03	106.24	238.21
Wyoming	4.5	50	11.60	126.63	255.22

Table 3

Equity in the Food Stamps Program

FY 1976

	Children Served as a Percent of Residents under 18	Children Served as a Percent of Poor Children	Expenditure per Resident under 18	Expenditure per Poor Resident under 18	Expenditure per Child Served
All States	14.5%	98%	$41.23	$278.05	$283.94
Alabama	17.6%	96%	$52.50	$285.12	$297.65
Alaska	4.2	54	16.81	215.20	399.93
Arizona	12.7	68	39.85	213.01	313.94
Arkansas	21.3	94	63.65	281.00	298.76
California	13.4	92	35.96	245.56	267.44
Colorado	10.9	97	35.12	314.51	323.05
Connecticut	10.5	109	30.06	313.51	286.46
Delaware	11.4	109	32.67	311.26	285.98
D.C.	32.5	191	83.64	491.41	257.35
Florida	18.7	204	64.45	700.14	343.77
Georgia	18.4%	82%	$54.30	$242.65	$295.15
Hawaii	19.6	186	68.17	646.48	347.03
Idaho	8.9	75	22.17	187.42	248.34
Illinois	15.8	98	52.35	326.06	331.90
Indiana	8.3	83	24.99	250.94	302.10
Iowa	7.1	85	18.77	225.01	265.00
Kansas	5.2	54	12.17	132.28	233.37
Kentucky	22.3	105	68.70	322.14	307.80
Louisiana	21.2	89	65.29	272.33	307.39
Maine	21.5	137	61.43	392.69	285.80
Maryland	12.2%	112%	$37.85	$349.73	$311.12
Massachusetts	20.8	193	45.74	424.20	219.81
Michigan	12.9	104	27.87	223.70	216.07
Minnesota	8.2	83	21.89	223.40	267.91
Mississippi	25.1	76	77.20	235.46	307.66
Missouri	11.2	74	53.33	352.62	474.86
Montana	8.0	59	23.28	172.44	291.62
Nebraska	5.4	51	13.72	130.94	255.04
Nevada	8.9	77	32.33	277.73	361.09
New Hampshire	11.9	113	32.67	308.52	274.09
New Jersey	14.0%	112%	$45.74	$365.91	$327.48
New Mexico	19.7	75	62.11	237.70	315.13
New York	15.4	112	33.35	242.08	216.07
North Carolina	16.2	88	47.66	260.85	295.00
North Dakota	4.2	36	12.70	107.42	299.25
Ohio	15.1	115	46.78	355.13	309.38
Oklahoma	12.2	76	28.81	180.58	236.56
Oregon	16.1	165	43.25	444.35	268.64
Pennsylvania	14.5	110	33.37	250.96	230.32
Rhode Island	22.7	201	49.62	439.93	218.57
South Carolina	21.8%	91%	$67.90	$283.51	$311.87
South Dakota	7.6	53	20.43	141.03	267.78
Tennessee	18.4	90	58.39	285.32	317.62
Texas	14.2	69	41.00	199.33	289.36
Utah	5.7	62	14.08	153.91	248.60
Vermont	17.5	95	44.04	239.78	252.24
Virginia	10.4	76	28.53	207.17	274.24
Washington	12.0	111	36.78	339.88	285.14
West Virginia	21.8	108	53.99	267.86	248.01
Wisconsin	6.9	68	15.43	148.64	225.03
Wyoming	4.4	48	12.83	140.00	292.28

Table 4

Equity in the National School Lunch Program

FY 1976

	Children Served as a Percent of Residents under 18	Children Served as a Percent of Poor Children	Expenditure per Resident under 18	Expenditure per Poor Resident under 18	Expenditure per Child Served
All States	41.3%	279%	$21.86	$147.17	$52.78
Alabama	54.3%	295%	$35.16	$190.92	$64.66
Alaska	25.8	330	10.48	134.19	40.65
Arizona	33.9	181	19.33	103.32	56.93
Arkansas	55.4	244	33.49	147.84	60.46
California	28.1	192	17.04	116.36	60.65
Colorado	37.7	338	15.72	140.79	41.65
Connecticut	31.4	327	14.44	150.70	46.03
Delaware	48.6	463	20.93	199.35	43.04
D.C.	40.7	239	34.01	199.79	83.62
Florida	47.1	221	26.87	126.14	57.06
Georgia	54.9%	245%	$35.62	$159.18	$64.65
Hawaii	65.3	619	22.71	215.32	34.79
Idaho	38.1	322	13.09	110.58	34.33
Illinois	32.4	202	17.56	109.40	54.21
Indiana	43.9	440	15.73	157.94	35.86
Iowa	51.6	618	18.58	220.26	35.63
Kansas	44.2	480	19.47	211.63	44.07
Kentucky	60.7	285	26.91	126.18	44.32
Louisiana	62.3	260	39.53	164.88	63.44
Maine	47.0	300	25.88	165.42	55.09
Maryland	34.8%	322%	$18.26	$168.69	$52.44
Massachusetts	48.2	447	20.11	186.46	41.71
Michigan	29.1	233	12.85	103.19	44.18
Minnesota	51.3	524	19.23	196.20	37.45
Mississippi	55.9	170	24.01	127.62	74.89
Missouri	47.1	311	21.76	143.89	46.20
Montana	38.1	282	16.06	118.95	42.19
Nebraska	42.9	409	15.94	152.05	37.15
Nevada	29.1	250	11.99	102.99	41.14
New Hampshire	33.4	315	13.43	126.84	40.20
New Jersey	29.3%	234%	$15.35	$122.83	$52.41
New Mexico	48.1	184	33.49	128.16	69.69
New York	36.8	267	21.03	152.65	57.10
North Carolina	58.2	318	41.39	226.52	71.09
North Dakota	45.5	385	18.11	153.17	39.83
Ohio	37.9	287	17.43	132.31	46.04
Oklahoma	49.8	312	24.49	153.54	49.15
Oregon	39.0	401	16.08	165.16	41.23
Pennsylvania	37.6	283	17.75	133.48	47.20
Rhode Island	34.1	303	21.20	187.99	62.14
South Carolina	56.9%	238%	$38.90	$162.42	$68.36
South Dakota	52.2	360	22.81	157.45	43.68
Tennessee	50.4	246	29.08	142.11	57.67
Texas	44.3	215	25.94	126.12	58.53
Utah	46.0	503	16.64	181.59	36.13
Vermont	45.2	246	20.91	113.85	46.28
Virginia	51.1	371	25.68	186.47	50.27
Washington	31.7	293	16.51	152.60	52.05
West Virginia	56.1	278	30.32	150.45	54.08
Wisconsin	36.9	356	14.19	136.71	38.42
Wyoming	35.8	390	13.25	144.55	37.04

Table 5

Equity in Title I - ESEA

FY 1976

	Children Served as a Percent of Residents under 18	Children Served as a Percent of Poor Children	Expenditure per Resident under 18	Expenditure per Poor Resident under 18	Expenditure per Child Served
All States	7.3%	49%	$28.20	$190.14	$388.64
Alabama	11.8%	64%	$38.61	$209.71	$327.01
Alaska	4.5	57	43.92	562.22	969.86
Arizona	8.3	44	22.64	121.03	272.26
Arkansas	11.6	51	41.88	184.92	362.41
California	8.7	60	24.86	169.76	284.63
Colorado	3.9	35	21.79	196.97	564.10
Connecticut	5.7	59	21.93	228.75	387.55
Delaware	5.5	51	31.41	299.30	585.37
D.C.	9.0	53	67.01	393.72	745.52
Florida	7.1	77	29.05	315.63	407.46
Georgia	8.9%	40%	$30.37	$135.76	$340.23
Hawaii	4.2	40	21.35	202.54	512.14
Idaho	3.9	33	21.95	185.64	566.29
Illinois	4.4	27	26.80	167.50	611.36
Indiana	6.2	62	15.13	151.96	245.17
Iowa	5.6	67	18.21	218.35	325.99
Kansas	5.2	56	22.08	239.96	430.31
Kentucky	10.4	49	32.23	151.14	309.64
Louisiana	12.2	51	40.80	170.18	334.89
Maine	12.1	78	23.32	149.09	192.07
Maryland	5.2%	48%	$24.82	$229.41	$473.98
Massachusetts	4.0	37	21.91	203.25	551.45
Michigan	4.9	39	29.71	238.56	610.48
Minnesota	4.9	50	23.48	239.70	476.74
Mississippi	15.3	46	53.65	163.63	350.96
Missouri	6.6	44	23.56	155.84	355.25
Montana	4.6	34	28.08	208.02	612.39
Nebraska	6.2	59	19.56	186.67	317.45
Nevada	2.7	23	13.36	114.78	497.79
New Hampshire	2.9	27	14.32	135.32	497.78
New Jersey	4.5%	36%	$26.80	$214.40	$589.52
New Mexico	6.8	26	40.33	154.34	589.09
New York	7.2	53	39.34	285.06	543.22
North Carolina	8.5	46	34.13	186.82	403.45
North Dakota	7.2	60	28.16	238.21	392.87
Ohio	3.7	28	17.11	129.91	460.26
Oklahoma	13.1	82	26.83	168.21	204.95
Oregon	5.7	59	27.03	277.73	470.89
Pennsylvania	8.3	62	26.82	201.74	323.14
Rhode Island	5.8	51	27.01	239.52	467.74
South Carolina	13.8%	58%	$38.33	$160.04	$277.62
South Dakota	7.3	50	28.77	198.62	394.45
Tennessee	7.8	39	32.22	157.49	410.28
Texas	11.1	54	31.76	154.45	286.48
Utah	4.1	45	13.99	152.97	339.24
Vermont	8.5	46	31.21	169.94	368.70
Virginia	6.6	48	28.26	205.27	425.80
Washington	6.0	55	24.22	223.89	403.21
West Virginia	8.3	41	34.50	171.20	414.47
Wisconsin	4.2	41	22.30	214.78	529.37
Wyoming	4.2	45	25.12	274.10	604.85

Table 6

Equity in the Vocational Education Basic Grants to State's Program

FY 1976

	Children Served as a Percent of Residents under 18	Children Served as a Percent of Poor Children	Expenditure per Resident under 18	Expenditure per Poor Resident under 18	Expenditure per Child Served
All States	13.4%	91%	$4.92	$33.16	$36.58
Alabama	13.5%	74%	$4.87	$26.45	$35.96
Alaska	19.9	255	7.05	90.28	35.44
Arizona	17.4	93	5.62	30.05	32.31
Arkansas	14.5	64	6.82	30.11	47.14
California	12.0	82	5.15	35.16	42.97
Colorado	9.3	83	3.16	28.28	33.91
Connecticut	23.9	250	5.53	57.72	23.07
Delaware	23.8	227	7.60	72.36	31.93
D.C.	7.9	46	9.58	56.31	121.53
Florida	25.0	271	2.11	22.95	8.46
Georgia	21.7%	97%	$3.36	$15.52	$16.03
Hawaii	14.1	134	3.15	29.85	22.34
Idaho	11.6	98	3.18	32.21	32.84
Illinois	16.0	99	3.95	24.67	24.76
Indiana	6.7	68	5.77	57.90	85.59
Iowa	13.6	163	3.17	37.94	23.21
Kansas	10.8	118	7.26	78.87	66.84
Kentucky	14.8	70	4.83	22.63	32.51
Louisiana	13.2	55	3.30	24.90	45.11
Maine	17.1	110	8.34	57.15	52.14
Maryland	14.5%	134%	$5.27	$48.69	$36.38
Massachusetts	9.1	85	4.80	44.48	52.48
Michigan	7.9	64	7.07	56.80	89.14
Minnesota	13.1	134	4.25	43.41	32.35
Mississippi	14.3	44	4.63	14.11	32.42
Missouri	10.9	72	4.74	46.34	64.12
Montana	10.1	75	3.59	35.59	47.61
Nebraska	12.0	115	5.66	54.03	47.07
Nevada	-	-	-	-	-
New Hampshire	25.7	243	7.21	68.13	28.01
New Jersey	15.5%	124%	$4.81	$38.44	$30.98
New Mexico	11.1	42	4.36	16.67	39.30
New York	11.9	86	3.77	27.39	31.72
North Carolina	18.9	103	6.97	36.93	35.76
North Dakota	18.2	154	4.85	40.99	26.56
Ohio	13.4	101	5.41	41.09	40.51
Oklahoma	11.6	73	6.27	39.30	54.12
Oregon	19.7	202	4.35	44.65	22.10
Pennsylvania	7.6	57	5.02	37.50	65.79
Rhode Island	12.7	113	8.83	78.26	69.44
South Carolina	14.9%	62%	$8.67	$36.19	$ 57.94
South Dakota	11.5	79	5.28	36.42	45.82
Tennessee	10.0	49	5.74	28.05	57.41
Texas	12.5	61	2.88	14.00	23.03
Utah	22.1	241	4.08	44.60	18.49
Vermont	11.7	64	8.54	46.48	73.07
Virginia	19.0	138	7.56	54.92	39.72
Washington	12.3	113	2.91	26.86	23.67
West Virginia	12.0	60	5.44	27.00	45.37
Wisconsin	9.9	95	3.37	31.52	33.05
Wyoming	14.2	154	6.62	65.64	42.49

Table 7

Equity in Medicaid Expenditures
FY 1976

	Children Served as a Percent of Residents under 18	Children Served as a Percent of Poor Children	Expenditure per Resident under 18	Expenditure per Poor Resident under 18	Expenditure per Child Served
All States	15.7%	106%	$31.30	$211.07	$199.98
Alabama	9.0%	53%	$13.88	$ 75.38	$141.94
Alaska	3.1	40	9.57	122.53	306.32
Arizona	-	-	-	-	-
Arkansas	11.4	50	20.54	90.67	180.11
California	22.8	155	57.48	392.52	253.31
Colorado	9.4	84	-	-	-
Connecticut	13.8	144	8.69	90.64	62.87
Delaware	17.7	168	22.35	212.93	126.43
D.C.	45.2	266	169.20	994.07	374.24
Florida	7.1	77	11.23	121.96	158.40
Georgia	18.6%	83%	$ 16.52	$ 73.83	$ 88.59
Hawaii	16.7	159	34.82	330.24	208.19
Idaho	6.4	55	13.22	111.81	204.98
Illinois	23.6	147	1.62	10.07	6.84
Indiana	8.0	81	16.58	166.46	205.92
Iowa	7.1	85	17.59	210.87	247.11
Kansas	10.6	115	16.08	174.71	151.92
Kentucky	6.5	31	22.50	105.50	344.01
Louisiana	12.8	53	18.48	77.09	144.66
Maine	18.1	116	44.03	281.93	243.27
Maryland	15.1%	139%	$ 37.45	$346.01	$248.70
Massachusetts	20.3	189	20.59	190.98	101.30
Michigan	18.1	146	56.22	451.34	309.49
Minnesota	9.2	93	17.14	174.96	187.24
Mississippi	17.0	52	21.95	66.96	128.96
Missouri	12.2	81	16.33	107.97	133.52
Montana	7.6	56	15.68	116.04	206.29
Nebraska	6.5	62	12.80	122.09	196.92
Nevada	6.3	55	19.14	164.47	301.54
New Hampshire	8.6	81	14.55	137.42	168.65
New Jersey	16.3%	130%	$ 49.24	$393.92	$302.34
New Mexico	10.3	39	17.56	67.20	170.44
New York	27.2	197	115.52	838.61	425.07
North Carolina	6.7	37	13.72	75.11	204.45
North Dakota	4.9	42	13.34	112.87	270.88
Ohio	12.2	93	22.68	172.16	185.56
Oklahoma	12.0	76	45.60	285.85	378.16
Oregon	14.2	145	34.03	349.57	240.32
Pennsylvania	29.5	222	-	-	-
Rhode Island	15.8	140	33.25	249.81	210.58
South Carolina	10.5%	44%	$ 13.96	$58.27	$133.11
South Dakota	7.9	55	14.26	98.44	179.50
Tennessee	12.1	59	20.00	97.76	164.65
Texas	6.8	33	11.10	53.98	163.14
Utah	6.7	74	9.04	98.79	133.85
Vermont	17.7	96	47.31	257.58	267.48
Virginia	10.2	74	20.30	147.52	198.67
Washington	10.3	96	17.61	162.73	170.06
West Virginia	16.1	80	-	-	-
Wisconsin	17.7	171	45.62	439.41	236.75
Wyoming	5.0	55	-	-	-

Table 8

Equity in the Headstart Program
FY 1976

	Children Served as a Percent of Residents under 18	Children Served as a Percent of Poor Children	Expenditure per Resident under 18	Expenditure per Poor Resident under 18	Expenditure per Child Serveu
All States	0.42%	2.8%	$6.15	$41.50	$1,478
Alabama	0.77%	4.2%	$10.36	$56.27	$1,336
Alaska	0.62	7.9	12.18	155.90	1,949
Arizona	2.66	1.4	9.36	50.05	3,577
Arkansas	0.79	3.5	9.22	40.72	1,161
California	0.23	1.6	4.77	32.56	2,048
Colorado	0.52	4.6	7.11	63.70	1,371
Connecticut	0.24	2.6	2.98	31.10	1,219
Delaware	0.40	3.9	6.71	63.95	1,648
D.C.	0.88	5.2	27.13	159.41	3,064
Florida	0.44	2.1	6.31	29.63	1,417
Georgia	0.41%	1.8%	$5.26	$23.49	$1,275
Hawaii	0.39	3.7	7.66	72.65	1,964
Idaho	0.33	2.7	6.46	54.64	1,997
Illinois	0.35	2.2	5.03	31.34	1,459
Indiana	0.32	3.3	3.94	39.56	1,216
Iowa	0.30	3.6	4.27	50.65	1,396
Kansas	0.39	4.2	5.69	61.87	1,473
Kentucky	0.90	4.2	10.68	50.10	1,184
Louisiana	0.66	2.7	8.04	33.53	1,222
Maine	0.43	2.8	6.25	39.92	1,451
Maryland	0.23%	2.3%	$4.15	$38.38	$1,749
Massachusetts	0.28	2.6	4.75	44.03	1,670
Michigan	0.27	2.1	3.55	28.53	1,331
Minnesota	0.31	3.2	4.55	46.39	1,460
Mississippi	3.77	11.5	49.14	149.87	1,304
Missouri	0.60	4.0	7.24	47.87	1,202
Montana	0.40	3.0	10.19	75.44	2,512
Nebraska	0.34	3.3	4.98	47.54	1,456
Nevada	0.17	1.5	4.75	40.77	2,803
New Hampshire	0.25	2.4	4.16	39.26	1,628
New Jersey	0.25%	2.0%	$ 5.06	$40.45	$1,992
New Mexico	0.85	3.3	10.57	40.44	1,242
New York	0.24	1.8	5.53	40.15	2,288
North Carolina	0.59	3.2	7.32	40.08	1,248
North Dakota	0.18	1.6	7.63	64.54	4,098
Ohio	0.36	2.6	3.94	29.93	1,173
Oklahoma	0.82	5.2	8.83	55.34	1,074
Oregon	0.20	2.1	4.26	43.76	2,075
Pennsylvania	0.22	1.7	3.82	28.71	1,710
Rhode Island	0.32	2.8	4.49	39.80	1,413
South Carolina	0.66%	2.8%	$ 7.40	$30.89	$1,122
South Dakota	0.27	1.8	8.21	56.71	3,084
Tennessee	0.67	3.3	7.94	38.78	1,176
Texas	0.41	2.0	5.35	26.01	1,311
Utah	0.26	2.8	4.71	51.43	1,818
Vermont	0.54	2.9	7.92	43.15	1,467
Virginia	0.28	2.1	4.12	29.95	1,455
Washington	0.33	3.1	5.07	46.87	1,534
West Virginia	0.68	3.4	10.77	53.43	1,574
Wisconsin	0.27	2.6	3.87	37.32	1,459
Wyoming	0.45	4.9	7.25	79.09	1,623

Means, Standard Deviations and Coefficients of Variation

	Children Served as a Percent of Residents under 18	Children Served as a Percent of Poor Children	Expenditure per Resident under 18	Expenditure per Poor Resident Under 18	Expenditure per Child Served
ESEA					
	$\bar{X}$ = 7.04	$\bar{X}$ = 48.75	$\bar{X}$ = 28.47	$\bar{X}$ = 206.05	$\bar{X}$ = 439.57
	S = 3.02	S = 13.15	S = 9.89	S = 73.94	S = 143.69
	V = .429	V = .270	V = .347	V = .359	V = .327
OASDI					
	$\bar{X}$ = 5.69	$\bar{X}$ = 41.04	$\bar{X}$ = 13.38	$\bar{X}$ = 99.10	$\bar{X}$ = 238.08
	S = 1.42	S = 8.09	S = 2.76	S = 24.19	S = 25.20
	V = .250	V = .197	V = .206	V = .243	V = .106
Food Stamps					
	$\bar{X}$ = 14.06	$\bar{X}$ = 98.22	$\bar{X}$ = 40.50	$\bar{X}$ = 281.55	$\bar{X}$ = 288.35
	S = 6.28	S = 39.98	S = 18.70	S = 117.79	S = 47.55
	V = .447	V = .407	V = .462	V = .418	V = .165
School Lunch					
	$\bar{X}$ = 43.85	$\bar{X}$ = 320.27	$\bar{X}$ = 21.90	$\bar{X}$ = 152.69	$\bar{X}$ = 50.14
	S = 9.95	S = 104.11	S = 7.83	S = 32.29	S = 11.71
	V = .227	V = .325	V = .358	V = .211	V = .233
Vocational Education					
	$\bar{X}$ = 14.30	$\bar{X}$ = 111.88	$\bar{X}$ = 5.33	$\bar{X}$ = 41.12	$\bar{X}$ = 42.60
	S = 4.68	S = 61.03	S = 1.82	S = 17.56	S = 20.95
	V = .327	V = .545	V = .341	V = .427	V = .492
Medicaid					
	$\bar{X}$ = 13.19	$\bar{X}$ = 97.48	$\bar{X}$ = 28.05	$\bar{X}$ = 207.08	$\bar{X}$ = 206.33
	S = 7.49	S = 53.96	S = 28.60	S = 189.67	S = 84.18
	V = .568	V = .553	V = 1.02	V = .916	V = .408
Headstart					
	$\bar{X}$ = 0.54	$\bar{X}$ = 3.18	$\bar{X}$ = 7.67	$\bar{X}$ = 51.29	$\bar{X}$ = 1695.65
	S = 0.59	S = 1.68	S = 6.97	S = 29.18	S = 643.19
	V = 1.18	V = .528	V = .909	V = .569	V = .379
AFDC					
	$\bar{X}$ = 10.87	$\bar{X}$ = 79.24	$\bar{X}$ = 10.52	$\bar{X}$ = 81.48	$\bar{X}$ = 95.02
	S = 5.25	S = 35.57	S = 7.30	S = 55.73	S = 34.17
	V = .483	V = .449	V = .694	V = .684	V = .360

NOTE: The means, standard deviations, and coefficients of variation were computed from the data in Appendix B.

The formulas are: $\bar{X} = \frac{\Sigma X}{N}$ $S = \sqrt{\frac{\Sigma X^2}{N} - (\frac{\Sigma X}{N})^2}$ $V = \frac{S}{\bar{X}}$